The Congregational Quarterly

Editor:
ALBERT PEEL, M.A., LITT.D.

Editorial Board:
REV. DOUGLAS HORTON, D.D. | REV. E. J. PRICE, M.A., B.D.
MR. B. L. MANNING, M.A. | REV. W. B. SELBIE, M.A., D.D.
MR. HAROLD SHEPHEARD, M.A.

The Congregational Union of England and Wales is not responsible for opinions expressed in these pages, nor is the Editor responsible for the views of contributors.

THE CONGREGATIONAL QUARTERLY is published on the 20th of March, June, September, and December, each quarter, by the Publication Department of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. It may be obtained from the publishers at 2s. 6d. a copy (plus postage), or 10s. per annum post free, or from any bookseller at 2s. 6d.

All contributions (typewritten where possible) should be addressed to the Editor at Shirley, Russell Road, Buckhurst Hill, Essex, with stamped envelope for return in case of non-acceptance.

Vol. XIII, No. 3 **JULY, 1935**

CONTENTS.

[For biographical sketches of the contributors see p. vii.]

		PAGE
EDITORIAL		273
THE REALISTIC MOVEMENT IN AMERICAN THEOLOGY	WALTER MARSHALL HORTON	283
WHAT SHALL I DO IF MY SON WANTS TO JOIN THE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS?	VERA BRITTAIN	296
PAUL'S KNOWLEDGE OF JESUS	J. A. ROBERTSON	301
EXPERIENCES OF A SEEKER OF TRUTH	J. W. POYNTER	311
EXTEMPORE PRAYER IN THE CONGREGATIONAL TRADITION	NATHANIEL MICKLEM	320
L. E. L.—A CENTURY-OLD TRAGEDY	MARY BRADFORD WHITING	335
DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS—		
PROGRESSIVE EVANGELISM	A. E. GARVIE	346
PRESCRIPTION AND DIAGNOSIS	E. CLIFFORD KNOWLES	350
THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION AND THE CHURCH	IRIS CORBIN	353
THE MAY MEETINGS	L. A. BENHAM	358
ON LIFE AND BOOKS—		
EITHER—OR	ALBERT PEEL	359
WORTH NOTING. FROM RECENT BOOKS		362
FOREIGN REVIEWS. By Drs. S. CAVE and W. B. SELBIE		364
CURRENT LITERATURE. By Drs. SYDNEY CAVE, A. J. GRIEVE, W. B. SELBIE, J. D. JONES, and E. H. THIMAN		369
SHORTER NOTICES. By the EDITOR, the Revs. E. J. PRICE, M.A., B.D., A. T. S. JAMES, B.A., M.Sc., Drs. W. B. SELBIE and H. WHEELER ROBINSON		374
PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS		399

(Made and Printed in Great Britain.)

THE IDEAL GIFT FOR ALL TIMES

IN THE STEPS OF THE MASTER

by H. V. MORTON

A Book of Profound Appeal to every Christian

THE METHODIST RECORDER:
"THE MOST FASCINATING TRAVEL BOOK ANY VISITOR TO PALESTINE HAS EVER WRITTEN, AND ONE OF THE MOST REVEALING COMMENTARIES ON THE HOLY WRIT."

Dr. F. W. NORWOOD, of the City Temple, writes:
". . . MR. MORTON'S TOUCH IS DELICATE AND DISCRIMINATING. . . . IT IS REVERENT AND NEVER PROPAGANDIST. HE TAKES HIS READERS WHEREVER HE KNOWS, OR EVEN THINKS, THAT CHRIST HAS BEEN."

The Greatest Religious Book of the Century

7/6

24 Illustrations

RICH & COWAN Ltd., 25 Soho Square, LONDON, W.1

It might have been otherwise

To look at the smiling faces of the girls and boys in the National Children's Home, it is hard to believe that behind each little life is a story of tragedy and sorrow.

Irrespective of class or creed — solely because of their great need — these children are being given the chance which misfortune has denied.

PLEASE HELP US TO HELP THEM

NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME & ORPHANAGE

(Founded by Dr. Stephenson, 1869) *Principal*—REV. JOHN H. LITTEN

Chief Offices—HIGHBURY PARK, LONDON, N.5

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.

Rev. WALTER MARSHALL HORTON, A.B. (Harvard), M.A., Ph.D. (Columbia), B.D., S.T.M. (Union Theological Seminary). Professor of Philosophy at Oberlin College, Ohio. Author of *Theism and the Modern Mood, A Psychological Approach to Theology, Theism and the Scientific Spirit,* and *Realistic Theology.*

Miss VERA BRITTAIN. Author of *Testament of Youth.*

Rev. J. A. ROBERTSON, M.A., D.D. Professor of New Testament Language, Literature, and Theology, Church of Scotland College, Aberdeen.

Mr. J. W. POYNTER. Formerly a Roman Catholic. Author of many books about the Roman Church.

Rev. NATHANIEL MICKLEM, M.A., D.D. Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford.

Miss MARY BRADFORD WHITING. Author of *Dante, The Man and the Poet, The Plough of Shame, etc.*

Rev. A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D., D.Th. Principal Emeritus of Hackney and New College, London. Ex-Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales.

Rev. E. CLIFFORD KNOWLES, M.A. Congregational Minister, Tolworth.

Miss IRIS CORBIN, B.A. (Lond.). For ten years a member of the Editorial Staff of the London Missionary Society.

Mr. ERIC H. THIMAN, Mus.Doc., F.R.C.O. Organist, Park Chapel, Crouch End.

JAMES POWELL & SONS (WHITEFRIARS) LIMITED
100 WIGMORE ST LONDON · W.1

ARTISTS IN STAINED GLASS MOSAICS & MURAL TABLETS AND CHURCH DECORATION

AN ILLUSTRATED BOOKLET TOGETHER WITH A LIST OF CHURCHES CONTAINING WINDOWS DESIGNED & MADE BY MESSRS. POWELL WILL BE SENT ON APPLICATION

The Story of St. Dunstan's

There are few people who have not heard of St. Dunstan's, which still looks after nearly 2,000 war-blinded ex-Service men.

Not so many perhaps have heard a St. Dunstan's man himself telling the story of St. Dunstan's.

Why not let a St. Dunstaner come to lecture to you? He will tell you all about St. Dunstan's world-flung work. He will tell you how its gallant 2,000 were blinded during the War. He will show how they might have been broken by their disability. He will explain how St. Dunstan's stepped in and proved a sure shield between them and the outside world until they could, in the phrase of the late Sir Arthur Pearson, the founder of St. Dunstan's, "learn to be blind."

No charge is made for such a lecture. Nor is there any appeal for funds. Each is designed solely as a description of the work of St. Dunstan's.

For vacant dates and further details apply to:—

The Appeals Organiser - ST. DUNSTAN'S HEADQUARTERS
INNER CIRCLE - REGENTS PARK - LONDON, N.W.1
Telephone No. WELBECK 7921

The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL.

PROF. J. W. HAUER, the "prophet" of the German Faith Movement, is well-known to many one-time students in Oxford. Some of the facts in regard to his stay at Mansfield have been incorrectly stated and we have asked Dr. W. B. Selbie, the former Principal of Mansfield, to give our readers correct information. He writes:—

> Hauer came to Oxford in 1911 with strong recommendations from the authorities of the Basel Mission in South India. They wanted him to take special work in Philosophy and Theology with a view to becoming head of a Training College. He applied for entrance to Mansfield, but all we could do for him was to give him the hospitality of the Junior Common Room while he took his degree. So he joined Jesus College and took a first in "Greats" just before the War. He then read for a B.Litt. until he was rounded up along with other Germans in Oxford and ultimately interned. As he was an ordained Lutheran pastor he ought really to have been allowed to return to Germany as soon as the War broke out, but unfortunately he had not his ordination papers with him—though he had certificates of military training, which, of course, were worse than useless. After some trouble we got his ordination papers, and he was allowed to go back to Germany when the War was about eighteen months old. His internment experiences were unfortunate; I visited him when he was in camp and found things pretty bad. When he got back to Germany he became an Army Chaplain to the end of the War.
>
> During his Oxford years he made the most of his associations with Mansfield and was certainly a very welcome and popular addition to our fellowship. He was a good speaker and could keep his end up well in any discussion and was altogether a charming and forceful personality. He gave promise also of being a very fine scholar, especially in the field of Comparative Religion. The books he has published since 1918 show how well this promise has been fulfilled.
>
> How such a man could give himself to the German Faith propaganda passes my comprehension. Some of his early work, however, does exhibit a tendency to the bizarre which may have more significance than one thought at the time. I would refer those who are interested in Hauer's antecedents to two books published about 1922 when he was a Privatdozent at Tübingen, viz., *Werden und Wesen der Anthroposophie* and *Die Anfänge der Yogapraxis*.

* * *

ONCE more the May Meetings of the Congregational Union have come and gone. They were marked by a searching address from the Chair, good preaching and speaking, and genial fellowship, but is it merely increasing years that give the impression that Congregationalism has not the giants of former days? Once more, however, we are

faced with the problem of translating "uplift" into action. What precisely is to happen in the churches as a consequence of the May Meetings—in regard to the Christian impact on war or unemployment, in regard to spiritual renewal? That is a question to which ministers and people alike must set themselves. If our Assemblies lead to emotion only, and not to action, they do harm and not good. In regard to unemployment, at any rate, the Friends supply the answer, which may be found cogently stated in Mr. J. S. Hoyland's *The Way of St. Francis and To-day* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d. & 2s. 6d.). Mr. Hoyland's experience of groups working with and for the unemployed in this country, or with and for the homeless in India, has convinced him that in such voluntary manual labour Christians can best serve their brethren and their Lord, and only thus can they make Christianity other than it is at present, a religion of the middle classes only. Mr. Hoyland suggests that in the spirit of St. Francis Christians should form a new Tertiary movement, a fellowship based on these principles:

(1) To follow Christ as literally as family obligations allow.
(2) To limit personal expenditure to the simplest possible scale, and to use the residue for the benefit of the dispossessed.
(3) To work for the dispossessed with our own hands at manual service, especially for those who are ill or in other ways more needy than their fellows.
(4) To stand aside from all war and all aggressive nationalism, and to labour in action for peace and goodwill amongst the nations, by working manually for and with those of other races and nations who are in need.
(5) Never to work for reward, but to take what is given gladly.

* * *

THE position of youth in the world to-day gives ground for serious thought. The International Labour Office estimates that of the 30,000,000 workers unemployed at the present time no less than 25 per cent are young persons under 25. In Austria and Italy more than 40 per cent of the unemployed are under that age. Youth is still paying for the blundering and folly of those who made the War, and the strange thing is that, in our own country at any rate, the older generations are still in charge of the world's affairs. Reading a debate on the international situation in the House of Commons recently we could not help but be struck by the fact that all the main participants were in their sixties or seventies. Experience is not to be despised, but it is high time that younger men were given their right and proper share in the conduct of national affairs, especially when so many of the older men show themselves to be unable to escape from a pre-War mentality. How unusual is the participation of youth in the affairs of State can be gathered from the fuss made about the elevation of Mr. Anthony Eden (aged 38) to the Cabinet.

And this applies not merely to the business of government, but to other branches of communal life. There is a marked tendency, for example, to look to those who have retired from active political life for Governors of the B.B.C., where most of all we need youth and vision and the forward look. Fortunate, indeed, was it that a young man was given charge of the B.B.C. in the person of Sir John Reith, to whom the country owes far more than it realizes. Incidentally, are we mistaken in thinking that the Roman Church is again affording evidence that it has not lost its skill in securing positions of influence for its members?

In Church life, especially, extreme nervousness is shown at calling youth to positions of responsibility. Fifty is "young" to an ecclesiastical assembly and the average age of the "Young People's Committee", even of a progressive denomination, is liable to be not less than the half century. There are obvious reasons for this, of course: only older laymen have leisure and only older ministers are sufficiently well-known to be elected to national committees. The undue conservatism of religious organizations is, we are sure, largely due to this fact, and those who have influence in them would be wise to exercise all their ingenuity to secure a leaven of youth in all their assemblies and committees.

The Church of Christ must look to it, too, if youth is not to be lost altogether. One of the most striking features of modern life on the Continent is the way in which the "Youth Movements," originally pacifist and international, have almost entirely gone over to Fascism or Communism. If the Church of Christ cannot provide scope for the ideals of youth then youth will inevitably look elsewhere. But what is the Church doing to summon youth to a campaign which will thrill those with strength and energy and a passion for social justice? What is the Church doing to adapt her methods to the new world in which boys and girls are growing up? A wise American observer recently said:

> The automobile multiplied by 10 the younger generation's powers of motion. The movies multiplied by 100 their powers of seeing. The radio multiplied by 1,000 their powers of hearing. Meanwhile, their spiritual powers have remained unchanged.

* * *

And not only youth. Every traveller in the world to-day is impressed perhaps most of all by the ubiquity of the cinema. Once we stop to think of the millions of people in every land who go regularly to the cinema we see how impossible it is to measure its power for good or evil. There are indications that the Church of Christ is at last waking up to this fact, but it has been so slow and timid. Soviet Russia has realized to the full the value of the cinema for propaganda purposes. Note these Soviet opinions:

> Film propaganda clarifies all our activities; it opens for us a road by which we can penetrate the masses; it increases our influence upon the people; it reinforces that influence with a minimum of effort; it popularizes our mots d'ordre.
>
> *C'est par le ciné que l'on charge les hommes de poudre à feu revolutionnaire comme si c'était des fusils.*

The Church must learn from Communism in this and in other fields if she is to be about her Master's business. Communism has adopted the practice of the early Christians—it is, alas, rarely to be found in Christian circles now—one individual tells the "good news" to another and wins him for the cause. A little "cell" of Communists is formed in every street and workshop and classroom. Dr. Stanley Jones has pointed out recently how in China a Communist is set in the midst of twenty-five students and expected to convert them, while in Russia the slogan is

> Not a single school nor a children's organization without a cell of the Union of the Militant Godless.

So often to-day Christians seem content to gather in little groups of people like-minded with themselves. Though they are enjoined to be in the world but not of the world yet apparently they ignore altogether those who are without. An article by "A Curate" in the April number of *The Modern Churchman* on "The Widening Gulf between Church and People" sets forth the position very clearly, and it is disquieting indeed. If Christians do nothing more than have fellowship with each other, always "talking shop," spending their leisure in social engagements with the same people, how can they expect to impress those who never enter a church or have any religious contacts? How many "publicans and sinners" does the average Church member deliberately associate with? Are Christians better than their Lord? Or do they take the Pharisaical view?

* * *

Meanwhile those who are pessimistic about modern youth might find encouragement as well as amusement in these words from Mr. Frank Hardie's essay in *Growing Opinions*:

> During those four years (and to a great extent since) there has scarcely been a public political meeting of any importance for the gown as opposed to the town at Oxford which I have not attended. On the basis of that experience I have formed a very clear and definite view as to what kind of political speech "goes down" with Oxford undergraduates. I have listened to Lloyd George, with a magnificent wealth of gesture, telling us that "the thunder clouds were rolling up." Subsequently, he was generally held to have been a complete "flop." I have, on the other hand, heard Willie Graham holding a large audience spellbound for an hour and a half with an austere recital of the operation of Trade Facilities Acts and Export Credit schemes. James Maxton captured the heart of a meeting which packed the Union Debating Hall with his two opening words: "Fellow Workers" . . . The same success attended the opening sentence of a

speech by Jimmy Thomas at a Union Presidential Debate. Mr. Thomas at the time had, Canute-like, conspicuously failed to check the rising tide of the unemployment figures, and was in actual process of transition from the office of Lord Privy Seal to that of Secretary of State for the Dominions. He was greeted on rising with the loud applause which is accorded to every distinguished visitor to the Union without respect of person. As it died down, he remarked, " 'Ow unlike the 'Ouse of Commons."

* * *

NOT long ago we deplored the comparative rarity of Congregational contributions to learning in recent years. Of this scarcity of books by Congregationalists there are of course many explanations. Ministers in charge have little leisure for writing, and Principals and Professors in Colleges are often so burdened with administrative and denominational duties that their time for constructive thinking is limited. Congregationalism has no Canonries, and even when its scholars make an attempt to secure freedom for study, the calls made on them for denominational service are so numerous and clamant that they are hard to resist. Despite the difficulties, however, we must refuse to be satisfied with the position of Congregationalism in this respect to-day. Fairbairn and Forsyth, Dale and Mackennal, were busy men, but their learning served the Church of God; they were in the van of the quest for truth. Nearer our own day College Principals now retired—like Drs. Selbie, Garvie, and Griffith-Jones—poured forth a steady stream of books of which we had no need to be ashamed. In the last five years, however, our College Principals in England, with the exception of Dr. Franks, have published little, partly, no doubt, because many of them are new to their jobs, but largely because, within and without their Colleges, they have innumerable duties thrust upon them. We wish that all who have to do with the Colleges would remember that it is to the Principals we must mainly look for Congregational works of learning, and that the Principals themselves would say to all who invite them to tasks which others could just as well perform: "We are doing a great work and cannot come down."

From Professors, too, we have had little during the last five years; a translation of Dibelius by Dr. Woolf and a volume from the Rev. E. R. Micklem seem to be about all. It would be excellent and perhaps salutary if the *Congregational Year Book* were to revert to the practice of printing each year a list of works published by Congregationalists during the year. Are we mistaken in supposing that our Manses no longer furnish the publishers with acceptable manuscripts as they once did? The Rev. A. G. Matthews has worthily filled Dr. Nightingale's place; Dr. Camfield has shown himself a worthy pupil of Forsyth; and the Rev. T. B. Howells has rejoiced our hearts by proving that there is learning in the village

manse. But where are our Dale and Stoughton, our Darlow and Horne?

This having been said by way of stimulus and hope that the lean years are over, we must go on to say how gratified we are that one of our number is set in a place which enables him to make those contributions to scholarship of which we are rightly proud—Prof. C. H. Dodd, Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis in the University of Manchester. Prof. Dodd's *The Authority of the Bible* and *The Epistle to the Romans* have now been followed by *The Bible and the Greeks* (Hodder, 10s. 6d.), in which he tackles two important questions, "The Religious Vocabulary of Hellenistic Judaism" and "Hellenistic Judaism and the *Hermetica*." Dr. Dodd has already written about the *Hermetica* in our own pages, and those who read what he has to say about Scott's edition will be glad to have this extended treatment. Dr. Dodd has that combination of gifts which is the mark of the true scholar—not merely immense industry, wide learning, true insight, and the power to co-ordinate knowledge gathered from various fields, but also appreciation of what has been done in the past without being enslaved by it. Thus in both sections of this work readers will find that he both extends their knowledge and stimulates their critical faculty. That is the function of the true Professor, and what more can a student desire?

It is with great pleasure, too, that we welcome a volume by one who bears a name honoured in the denomination—Dr. Howard H. Scullard. Dr. Scullard's *History of the Roman World 753-146 B.C.* appears in Methuen's "History of the Greek and Roman World" series (15s.), the Editor of which is Dr. M. Cary. Dr. Scullard had no easy task in bringing this period within the scope of one volume, but he has performed it with skill and care, and with a sound, if unobtrusive scholarship. Students will find the chronological table unusually helpful, while the Select Bibliography and the Appendixes add to the book's value. The only criticisms we have to offer are that sometimes it is not easy to see the wood for the trees, and there has been undue economy in the provision of maps. A map of Italy in 150 B.C. is an altogether insufficient guide for the history of the peninsula in the previous 600 years.

To crown these two admirable volumes comes a fine piece of work by a Congregational layman, Major N. G. Brett-James of Mill Hill. Of his *The Growth of Stuart London* (Allen & Unwin, 25s.) we have written more at length in the *Transactions* of the Congregational Historical Society. Here we simply say that we live in hope that the three volumes now mentioned are harbingers, and that they herald the dawn of a day when Congregationalism will again serve the Church of God in the field of scholarship as aforetime. If College Boards will see that their Principals and Professors have ample

opportunity for study, if young ministers will make time for research and the continuation of work started in their College days, our "List of Books published by Congregationalists" will once more be a matter for pride and gratitude. The Inaugural Lecture of the Rev. E. R. Hughes, the newly appointed Reader in Chinese Religion and Philosophy at Oxford—*Oxford and the Comparative Study of Chinese Philosophy and Religion* (Oxford Press, 2s.)—is another encouraging sign.

* * *

THERE is not the slightest doubt that the institution of Christian marriage is being subjected to the severest scrutiny. Equally there is not the slightest doubt that the Christian Church is failing, not only to provide a convincing defence, but also to give adequate counsel and advice to those who marry. More and more people are married in registry offices, and it is to be feared that a large number of those who marry in Christian churches are allowed to do so without any preparation for the new state on which they are entering. It is probable, of course, that many ministers feel quite incompetent to give guidance and instruction to those entering on married life. If, however, we do believe that the Christian home is one of the greatest instruments for good in the world, the Churches should surely be prepared to give counsel and help to those who are making homes.

Recently the Federal Council of Christian Churches in the United States sent a questionnaire to a group of ministers whom they knew had a special interest in the question of the family. They were asked if they held interviews with those about to marry, and the impression obtained was that the custom was far from usual, although it is a fact that a canon law of the Episcopal Church requires instruction to be given.

The colleges were also circularized and asked whether students were advised to conduct interviews. It was found that this course was recommended by four colleges out of every five.

Again, does the responsibility of ministers cease with the conduct of the marriage service? In one extreme case in the American inquiry a minister replied, "Of two hundred and eighty-five couples whom I have married I know the whereabouts of only eleven, and am in touch with one."

All men engaged in pastoral work cannot but realize the opportunity presented at the beginning of family life. All ministers worth their salt should secure as far as maybe the friendship of their young people. They will then be amazed at the way they ask for help at the time of their marriages, and at the trust reposed in them later; if ministers seized the opportunity family life would often begin and be continued with the counsel as well as the blessing and goodwill of the Christian Church.

A novel reviewed in these pages, the work of a candidate for a University seat in Parliament, suggests what will happen to the Christian home if some of the "moderns" get their way. Propaganda for "freedom" will inevitably succeed if the Christian Church allows the matter to go by the board. To denounce the exponents of sexual freedom is not enough : the Church must be prepared to give positive teaching to all who come for marriage, and show them how to set to work to make marriage successful.

* * *

Some years ago we had the honour of lecturing in Berkeley, California, under the Chairmanship of Prof. W. F. Badè, and we learnt of the excavation work in Palestine of which Dr. Badè had charge. Recently we have seen the results of such work in the Holy Land and the Near East, and have met many of those engaged in it. In Old Corinth we saw the work proceeding, and were shown over the parts of the old city which have been laid bare. These facts have no doubt added to the fascination Dr. Badè's *A Manual of Excavation in the Near East* (California & Cambridge Presses, 7s.) has had for us, but those who have never seen a Tell or met an excavator will, we are confident, read this book and look on its illustrations with great interest. Not only so, but the volume will undoubtedly prove a *vade-mecum* to all those engaged on "digs." It tells of the methods of digging and recording used by Dr. Badè and his helpers at the Tell-en-Nasbeh—the ancient Mizpah. How do excavators set to work, how is a gang organized and managed, how are finds made, recorded, photographed? Of all this entrancing work Dr. Badè tells. Lands like Palestine are honeycombed with history, and gradually their past is being exposed to view by the skill of the excavators. Fortunate, indeed, are those who can have a share in this important and greatly rewarding enterprise.

* * *

The Theological Conference of Congregationalists will be held this year at Cambridge at Westminster College, from 8th-11th July. It will be presided over by Mr. E. Cunningham, M.A., and the subject is "The Christian Doctrine of Man." The following is the programme :

Monday, 8th July. 5.0 p.m. God, Man and Natural Law. Prof. H. F. Lovell Cocks, M.A., B.D.

Tuesday, 9th July. 10.15 a.m. God, Man and Moral Experience. Dr. John Short, M.A. 5.0 p.m. Man and His Religious Experiences. Dr. W. A. Painter, M.A., B.D.

Wednesday, 10th July. 10.15 a.m. The Faith of Jesus concerning Man. The Rev. G. Currie-Martin, M.A., B.D. 5.0 p.m. Sin and Forgiveness. Prin. J. S. Whale, M.A.

Thursday, 11th July. 10.15 a.m. The Shape of the Kingdom. The Rev. Malcolm Spencer, M.A.

For particulars apply Mr. A. B. Russell, J.P., 18 Well Walk, N.W.3.

* * *

Among the best stories of the quarter must be put that of the child whose mother, believing in the free method of education, insisted that his nurse must always let the boy have what he wanted. One day when loud shrieks were heard from the garden she cried out to the nurse, saying, "Haven't I told you he is to have anything he wants?" "Yes, madam," said the nurse, "He's got it. It's a wasp!"

That story is not without its moral for educationalists—and preachers! And the same is true of these:

In Bishop Welldon's *Forty Years On* he tells how a Headmaster wrote a comment at the foot of a boy's essay. The boy himself could not read the comment nor could any of his class-mates. The form-master, having also failed, took it to the Head and asked him to decipher it. It was: "Bad writing"!

The good Lord Shaftesbury, hearing that a tenant of his was ill in bed set out to call. He took a short cut, and as he passed beneath an open window heard a voice, "Hie thee to bed, Jane, get big Boible out, 'ere's Lord Shaasbree a-coming!" and Jane was duly discovered in bed reading the Prophet *Amos* upside down.

* * *

We trust our readers gain inspiration from modern poets. Mr. Ezra Pound is said to be one of the best of them. We hope we are not infringing copyright in printing this complete poem of his:

Papyrus

Spring . . . .
Too long . . . .
Gongula . . . .

For more modern inspiration see our next issue.

* * *

Our correspondent writes: At the Royal Academy banquet Sir John Simon rightly said that the Academy showed that Ruskin's judgment was still true—British painters were eminent for their skill in portraiture, for the painting of the lower animals, and for landscape. If the Academy this year is dull, it is with the dullness of efficiency; so many of the paintings are merely competent and satisfactory from the point of technique, without being inspired; in this respect Mr. Edmond Brock's two portraits—of the Prime Minister and Princess Margaret Rose—may be said to be typical.

The *fracas* about Mr. Stanley Spencer's paintings drew much attention to the three pictures he desired to withdraw from the Academy. About them we can only repeat what we said last year: Mr. Spencer's pictures "may have their message for the initiated,

but to the average man they are in the main entirely incomprehensible." Mr. Spencer undoubtedly has talent, and it is to be regretted that he finds such strange ways of putting beauty on to canvas: we presume it is beauty he attempts to express, it certainly is not truth!

We are not so sure that it is not Mr. F. W. Elwell who comes best out of the Academy. The interiors he paints are all amazingly good, with "The Landlord" a real masterpiece. Mention ought to be made of Dame Laura Knight's interiors, "A Theatre Dressing-room" and "Make-up." Sir John Lavery's "The Rt. Hon. David Lloyd George, O.M., M.P." is successful, as are most of Mr. Augustus John's portraits. Mr. G. L. Brockhurst has half a dozen portraits, all good, with "Zeitgeist" perhaps the best. There will no doubt be controversy about Mr. Richard Sickert's exhibits. Here again we have an example of an artist of unusual talent who seems to run to the bizarre. Most of the people he paints are given blotches instead of faces, though in the rest of the painting the artist's talent is abundantly revealed: the remarkable portrait of Lord Castlerosse is a case in point. Politicians will be interested to contrast Mr. Frank O. Salisbury's paintings of Roosevelt and Mussolini.

Mr. A. J. Munnings actually gives us a picture without a horse, though he generally appears in the more familiar *rôle*. In one fine painting we seem to have his three main interests, "My Wife, My Horse, and Myself"! Among the landscapes those of Mr. Julius Olsson are conspicuously successful. Other pictures we found attractive were Mr. Russell Flint's "Judgment of Paris," Mr. Richard Jacks' "Young Canada," and, perhaps most of all, Mr. Keith Henderson's "Harbour Crowd."

There is not much in the way of humour, though we have Mr. George Belcher's "The Mourner" and Miss Phyllis Dodd's "Prudence," a delightful painting of a sleeping baby guarded by a teddy bear. Visitors will be wise not to overlook the paintings of Mr. Gerald Kelly and of one of the new R.A.'s, Mr. Cadogan Cowper, while they must certainly make a point of seeing Lady Hilton Young's bust, in bronze, of His Majesty the King. The busts this year strike us as being exceptionally good, with those of the late C. Sargeant Jagger, Mr. Charles Pibworth's "The Rt. Hon. Walter Runciman, D.C.L., LL.D., M.P." and Sir W. Reid Dick's "The Braille Reader" among the best.

THE REALISTIC MOVEMENT IN AMERICAN THEOLOGY.

I. The Passing of Calvinism and Liberalism.

THE two most widely influential movements in American theology, down to very recent times, have been those associated with the names of Jonathan Edwards and Horace Bushnell.

The New England theology of Edwards and his successors was a severely logical Calvinism, revised to meet the challenge of eighteenth-century rationalism and spiritually rejuvenated by the flaming evangelistic zeal of the Great Awakening. There was much in this theology which was shocking and disturbing to tender consciences and rational minds—as the Unitarians were continually pointing out—but it answered pretty nearly to the severe conditions of pioneer life, and continued to stir men to repentance throughout the early part of the nineteenth century, while the frontier swept westward.

With the rise of the cultural level and the growth of humanitarian sentiment toward the middle of the century, theological reconstruction became imperative. The strictures of the Unitarians against the morally repulsive and rationally paradoxical elements in Calvinism could no longer go unheeded, but it seemed to most Americans that the highly rational and humane Gospel which they offered in place of Calvinism was too cold and unimpassioned to replace the stirring message of traditional Christianity. At this juncture Horace Bushnell did for American theology what Schleiermacher had done for German theology at the beginning of the century, and what Coleridge had more recently been doing for British theology: he effected a complete change of base, which made it possible to reaffirm the more distinctive tenets of Christianity which go beyond the bare affirmations of natural religion—teachings concerning the deity of Christ, the Atonement, and the transmission of divine grace through social channels—while avoiding the rational and moral pitfalls into which Protestant orthodoxy had fallen. Liberal Evangelicalism in America has been for the most part following his lead ever since.

Bushnell's change of base was substantially identical with Schleiermacher's and with Coleridge's. The historical connexion is clear; Bushnell was delivered from his early theological uncertainties and perplexities by reading Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*. Like his English guide, he found his way out of the anomalies of the older orthodoxy through adopting certain of the central principles of Kantian and Post-Kantian idealism: the primacy of the practical reason and creative intuition over mere logic and ratiocination; the

interdependence of individuals within the continuing life of the social organism; the immanence of God in all things, nature and the supernatural together constituting "one system of God." Like Coleridge again—and unlike Schleiermacher—he rejected the pantheistic implications of the doctrine of divine immanence almost, if not quite, as decisively as he rejected the deistic implications of the older Unitarianism. Thus while American liberalism follows Schleiermacher in appealing to religious experience as the touchstone of theological doctrine, and while it reflects in many ways the influence of German philosophical idealism, it resembles English theology in the relative moderation of its "immanentism," and in a certain aversion to high-flown speculation. This may be due to the fact that when English and American theology finally came most definitely under German influence, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the reaction against speculative idealism was already under way in Germany, and the strongly ethical and social emphasis of Ritschlianism—most congenial to the Anglo-Saxon temper—had already in part superseded the mystical and metaphysical emphases of Schleiermacher and Hegel.

Moderate though it was, the idealistic trend in American liberal theology nevertheless stands out unmistakably as its determinative characteristic. From Emerson to Royce, our American philosophy was predominantly idealistic; and our theology faithfully reflected the changing moods and tenses of this philosophy. In Emerson's day, the prevailing type of idealism was the romanticism of Schleiermacher and Schelling; and Bushnell's theology, with moderation of course, reflects the literary and inspirational quality of this philosophy. When Darwin and Spencer compelled us to reconsider the implications of natural science for all our thinking, our idealistic philosophers turned rationalistic, and resorted to Hegel and Lotze in the endeavour to assimilate and spiritualize Spencer, while liberal theology followed willingly in their train. The most important school of religious thought emanating from this later period is the "personalism" of Borden Parker Bowne and his successors at Boston University. Based upon the personal idealism of Lotze, revised in the light of Christian theism, personalism is both a philosophy and the groundwork of a theology, and it has been enormously influential. To the Methodist Church within which it arose, it has come to be almost what Thomism is to the Roman Catholic Church, while it has moulded the thought of many theologians outside of Methodism —among whom may be mentioned the late Dr. Henry Churchill King, of Oberlin, and Dr. John Wright Buckham, of the Pacific School of Religion, both Congregationalists.

Down to the time of the World War, philosophical idealism in America continued to keep on good terms with theology. Its

exponents never ran off, like Bradley and Bosanquet in England, into an impersonal absolutism which shocked and repelled the religious consciousness. The last of our great idealists, Josiah Royce (died 1916), though generally classified as an Hegelian, was wont to say that he had learned more from Fichte and Schopenhauer than from Hegel; and his conception of God had accordingly a strong voluntaristic tinge, which made it more congenial to Christian theists than most forms of Absolute Idealism. He was profoundly interested in morals and religion, and a good deal of a theologian. In the first volume of his *Problem of Christianity* he dealt with sin and atonement so reverently and discerningly as to make most liberal theology seem shallow and flippant by comparison. So while there were some features of his system that were sharply criticized—his tendency to minimize the *rôle* of the historic Jesus, for example—the general tenor of his teaching was acceptable to his theological contemporaries, and there were to be found conservative Evangelicals who after attending his classes averred that he was becoming "sounder" every day, while Episcopalians found in his metaphysical doctrine of the Church a philosophical basis for Anglo-Catholicism.

II. The Promise and Failure of Pragmatism.

The collapse of idealistic philosophy in America was due to a number of antagonistic influences which had been undermining its foundations for some time, together with the great shock of the World War, which suddenly revealed the weakness of its optimistic assumptions, and made an end of the fair-weather world in which alone it could hope to stand. The Achilles' heel of most idealistic systems is the problem of evil; and the World War brought us face to face with evil on so colossal a scale, in such barbaric and appalling forms, that idealism simply could not assimilate these raw facts and accommodate them within its scheme of eternal harmony and steadily increasing order. Royce himself, who had in his younger days asserted the absolute truth of his philosophy, claiming that it was impossible to deny it without implicitly reaffirming it, now confessed that idealism had become to him a hope and a dream instead of a certainty. But before idealism thus collapsed in the hurricane of the War, carrying much theology down with it in its ruin, it had already, as we have said, been undermined by hostile criticism. This came in the main from its great philosophical rival, pragmatism, whose spectacular rise to prominence began in the early years of the twentieth century.

Pragmatism was believed at first to be a philosophy which might furnish a basis for the reconstruction of religious thought; but its

significance turned out to be transitory. It did great service as an engine of criticism, it gave rise to many new and stimulating insights, and it afforded many perplexed minds a sort of temporary intellectual shelter; but it led in the end to an impasse.

Under the leadership of William James, pragmatism not only opened great gaps in the idealistic "block-universe," but proposed an alternative faith: instead of an *optimism* based on the ultimate unity of all things in an infinite God, a *meliorism* based upon the possibility of conquering really wild and rampant evil through co-operation with a finite but tremendously vital and powerful God, whose presence was revealed in the uprush of "sthenic emotion" in the experience of religious conversion. This "piece-meal super-naturalism" of William James was in many respects better adapted to the war-time emergency than the idealistic monism it attacked; but James died some years before the War, and in his later years did much to weaken faith in his own religious teachings by his defence of a subjectivistic, individualistic theory of the nature of truth. This theory appeared to justify any kind of belief or disbelief which might be practically helpful to the individual, and raised the suspicion that the God of whom James had so eloquently spoken in *The Varieties of Religious Experience* might be nothing more than a useful assumption, adopted for its empirical "cash value" in stirring up one's sthenic emotions. Freudian psychology, whose vogue began soon after James's death, deepened the suspicion that religious faith might be a mere "rationalization" or "escape mechanism." It has been one of the main problems of American theology, ever since, to vindicate the objective validity of religious faith against these subjectivistic suspicions. While there is hardly a living American religious thinker upon whom the influence of William James has not in some way set its stamp, it would be hard to name anyone who has consistently followed him. Professor E. W. Lyman in his *Theology and Human Problems* (1910) made the most consistent attempt to found a system of religious thought upon Jamesian pragmatism; but he was even then exceedingly critical of many features of James's position, and has since passed over by gradual stages into the camp of realism[1].

After the death of William James, the leadership of the pragmatist movement fell into the hands of a man of a very different type, and a very different attitude toward religion—John Dewey. At first an Hegelian idealist, Dewey went through a sharp revulsion against metaphysical speculation of all sorts, in consequence of his perception of the bad practical consequences of idealistic monism; and for the greater part of his career at Chicago and Columbia Universities,

1 See his recent book, *The Meaning and Truth of Religion* (1933), 165-174, for an expression of his present realistic position.

where he has exerted a determinative influence upon the whole trend of thought, he continued to assert that the problems of epistemology and metaphysics were artificial problems, best solved by ignoring them. If in recent years he has begun to give more specific attention to metaphysical and even theological questions, his views of ultimate reality have never quite shaken off the veil of nebulosity beneath which they were for so many years concealed; and his main interest continues to centre in the field of practical affairs, especially in education and politics. His political philosophy has furnished a platform for many radical reformist groups in this country, very much as the Utilitarian philosophy of Bentham and Mill did in England a century ago; while his educational philosophy has been disseminated by eager disciples in many parts of the world, including China, Turkey, and Russia, where he has made extended visits. It would probably not be unfair to say that for Dewey religion and social passion are to all intents and purposes identical. The extension of the principles of democracy, through education and political agitation, means to him very much what the extension of the Kingdom of God means to the Christian.

It might be presumed that Dewey's philosophy would have comparatively little influence upon Christian thinkers, except perhaps in the fields of Ethics and Practical Theology; but, actually, it has been very great. Both at Chicago Divinity School and at Union Theological Seminary, New York, two of the most important liberal theological institutions in the country, the prevailing religious tendency for a generation has been the so-called "Social Gospel Movement"; and wherever this movement has gone, with its strong ethical and social emphasis, it has tended to throw the metaphysical aspect of theology into the background. Allied at first with Ritschlianism[1], the Social Gospel has tended to become more and more completely pragmatic in every sense of the word. At Union, on the whole, the pragmatic drift has not gone beyond what might be called a moderate Ritschlianism; at Chicago, after an initial period of Ritschlianism, represented by George Burman Foster, a more radical form of religious pragmatism, much closer to Dewey's, has developed under the leadership of men like Edward Scribner Ames, Gerald Birney Smith, and Eustace Haydon.

Professor Ames for many years contended that the word "God" symbolized a purely human and social sort of entity, of the same genus with "Alma Mater" or "Uncle Sam;" and though he has of

1 The greatest pre-war prophet of the Social Gospel, Professor Walter Rauschenbusch, of Rochester Theological Seminary, produced in his *Theology for the Social Gospel* the most significant theological work which has come from the movement. In his doctrine of social salvation ("the Kingdom of God") Rauschenbusch is almost completely Ritschlian; but his conception of God fluctuates indecisively between pantheistic and agnostic immanentism, thus opening the way for later humanistic developments.

late expanded his conception of God to take in a reference to the cosmic environment on which human society depends for support, it is clear that if society should suddenly be blotted out Professor Ames's God would vanish at once from the universe. Professor Smith, in one of his most significant writings[1], raised quite seriously the question whether theism is essential to religion, and answered it only tentatively in the affirmative; while Eustace Haydon has answered it decisively in the negative. He has been one of the most active leaders of a movement known as Humanism, which has won a number of Unitarian ministers to its non-theistic standard, and which recently issued a Manifesto declaring that "the time has passed for theism"[2]. John Dewey signed the Manifesto, but evidently finds the anti-theistic zeal of some of his theological colleagues a bit excessive, for he has just published a book on religion, entitled *A Common Faith,* in which he admits the reality of "God" while considerably deflating the historic meaning of the word. He says[3]:

> We are in the presence neither of ideals completely embodied in existence nor yet of ideals that are mere rootless ideals, fantasies, utopias. There are forces in nature and society that generate and support the ideals. They are further unified by the action that gives them coherence and stability. It is this *active* relation between ideal and actual to which I would give the name "God."

It goes almost without saying that the Humanist position is unacceptable to most of our theologians. The effect of the Humanist movement upon their minds has been to discredit the pragmatic philosophy whose logical outworking led to such a conclusion. Thus it may be said that Humanism to-day is repeating the *rôle* which Unitarianism played in American thought a century ago. As against the weaknesses and equivocations of our senescent liberal theology, its strictures are felt to have great force, as did the objections raised by Unitarianism against the moral and rational difficulties of Edwardean Calvinism; but as a substitute for the Christian Gospel, Humanism seems pretty thin and platitudinous—much more so than Channing's Unitarianism, which retained at least the backbone of ethical monotheism which Christianity inherited from the prophets of Israel. What an unkind critic said of President Eliot's address on "The Religion of the Future" might be said with greater justice of humanistic religion: "It is very much like a soda-cracker—perfectly wholesome, but you need something to take with it!" So as the religious weakness of Unitarianism compelled the abandonment of the rationalistic philosophy on which it was based, the religious weakness of Humanism is compelling the abandonment of the pragmatic philosophy on which it was based, and stimulating the

1 *Current Christian Thinking,* Chap. IX, "The Modern Search for God."
2 See *The New Humanist* for May-June, 1933, 1-5.
3 *Op. cit.,* 50-51.

search for a new and stabler basis for Christian theism. More and more, this basis is being found in some sort of *realism*.

III. The Rise of Realism.

Pragmatism at first promised great aid and comfort to religion; realism at first promised little or nothing. When "The Program and First Platform of Six Realists" appeared in the *Journal of Philosophy* (1910) followed soon afterward by the symposium *The New Realism* (1912), the initial impression of the new school was that it proposed to defend the objective truth of natural science against the sceptical assaults of the idealists and the pragmatists, and might be expected therefore to take a naturalistic rather than a religious turn. The impression was reinforced by the behaviouristic theory of mind maintained by Professor E. B. Holt, one of the contributors, and by the close connexion in which the whole school stood to the mathematical realism of Mr. Bertrand Russell, whose essay on "A Free Man's Worship" represented the complete negation of all Christian faith and hope. A second symposium by a somewhat different school of realists, *Essays in Critical Realism* (1920), did little to allay these misgivings, since it contained essays by George Santayana and Roy Wood Sellars, whose naturalistic leanings are most pronounced.

It is certainly characteristic of philsophical realism to make no promises in advance, to religion or to any other cherished human interest. Unlike idealism, it refuses to guarantee that reality—since it is the creation of mind—will be found to be thoroughly rational. Facts are facts, it says, and they are independent of our desires as they are independent of our minds. Disorder and evil are as evidently present in the world as harmony and goodness; and it is self-deception to protest that they must somehow be viewed as mere appearances. As Prof. R. B. Perry says[1]:

> Realism, in other words, rejects the doctrine that things must be good or beautiful or spiritual in order to be at all. It recognizes the being of things that are wholly non-spiritual, of things that are only accidentally spiritual, of things that, while they belong to the domain of spirit, nevertheless antagonize its needs and aspirations. The universe, or collective totality of being, contains things good, bad, and indifferent. But (he adds) before one hastily concludes that realism discourages endeavour and discredits faith, one will do well to recall that there is a sense in which disillusionment is a source of power . . . Well doing is conditioned by clear seeing . . . . The civilization of society has been served best by those who have been most clearly aware of its present failure. Similarly, within any field of individual endeavour it is the sanguine or complacent temperament that is ineffective . . . . To argue the eternal and necessary goodness of things from the implications of knowledge, is to encourage a comfortable assurance concerning salvation, when it is the office of religion to put

[1] *Present Philosophical Tendencies*, 329-331.

> men on their guard and rouse them to a sense of peril.
>
> If, then, realism is a philosophy of disillusionment . . . it removes illusions only in order to lay bare the confronting occasion and the available resources of action.

So far as Professor Perry's own philosophy is concerned, the "confronting occasion" is interpreted mainly in terms of the results of the natural sciences, and the "available resources" are mainly natural and human. His realistic humanism does not differ greatly from the pragmatic humanism of Dewey. Both Perry and Dewey believe man's place in the universe is less precarious than Bertrand Russell supposes, and his power to control his environment much greater than Santayana supposes; but they have rejected the idealistic Absolute so vehemently that they have included the God of Christian theism in the same wholesale condemnation, thus leaving man's destiny principally dependent upon his own resourcefulness in making the best of a basically impersonal world.

Needless to say, this is not the only possible outcome of a realistic theory of knowledge. If idealism is essentially a biased philosophy, leading inevitably to a religious philosophy of some sort, realism is essentially an unbiased philosophy, which may lead to *any* sort of religion or irreligion, according to the character of the real objects which each realistic philosopher enters in his inventory of that which is "given" or "discovered." That realism is consistent with Christian theism ought to be sufficiently evident from the realistic philosophy of the medieval scholastics, which the Neo-Thomists are now adapting to the data of modern science—often with great success. Among the American Neo-Realists, Professor W. P. Montague, of Columbia, has from the start showed marked leanings toward Christian theism, and in his *Belief Unbound* (1930) has developed a concept of a finite-infinite God, involved in the struggle with evil but at the same time transcending the cosmos, which has aroused much interest in theological circles.

But it is perhaps Professor Whitehead who has done most to exhibit the religious possibilities of realism and dissociate it from scientific naturalism. In his conception of God, it must be confessed, he stands more remote from Christian tradition than Professor Montague, and even reminds one at times, when he speaks of the "primordial" and "consequent" nature of God, of Hegelian pantheism, with its conception of a God who gradually comes to consciousness of Himself in the evolution of the human race. Yet the significant fact remains that Professor Whitehead has brought about a change in the whole "climate of opinion" in America, giving us realistic grounds for doubting the falsely "bifurcated" conception of Nature which we inherit from the founders of modern science, and creating faith that the laws of reason and the enduring values of æsthetics, morals, and religion are as much a part of the structure of

reality as are the stars and atoms with which our physical sciences deal. In so doing, he has carried us back out of the atmosphere of subjectivism which has hung over modern philosophy from Descartes and Locke to Kant and William James, and brought us once more into sympathetic touch with the realistic objectivism of the Platonic-Aristotelian tradition, from which Catholic thought has never so widely departed. When *Science and the Modern World* appeared in 1925, John Dewey generously exclaimed, "There is news in the realm of the mind!" Had the "news" been issued with "scare-headlines" appropriate to the occasion, Mr. Dewey himself might have been disconcerted at their purport:

MEDIEVAL REALISM REINSTATED!
ERA OF IDEALISM AND PRAGMATISM ENDED!
WHITEHEAD REPLACES DEWEY AS LEADING AMERICAN PHILOSOPHER!

Among theologians, as distinct from philosophers, the pioneer of American realism was undoubtedly Professor D. C. Macintosh, of Yale. Long before Whitehead came over from England to turn the tide in favour of realism, at a time when most liberal theologians were idealistic or pragmatic in their thinking, Dr. Macintosh had worked his way with logical tenacity through the fallacies of both the prevailing schools, and arrived at a realistic position, by a process of elimination. He has given an interesting account of his intellectual development, from traditional orthodoxy through idealism and pragmatism to realism, in his autobiographical contribution to *Contemporary American Theology* (Vol. I), and has reviewed the whole ground traversed, more objectively, in his Calcutta lectures on *The Pilgrimage of Faith in the World of Modern Thought.* When the symposium, *The New Realism,* appeared in 1912, he at once appreciated its importance. To his Ritschlian-Pragmatist teacher, George Burman Foster of Chicago, he wrote as follows on 7th May, 1912:

> What I think we need is a religious realism . . . The religious subjective idealism which leaves one with only the God-idea as his object is fatal, if taken seriously. Are you interested in the new realism? I am; I think it needs criticism, but I believe it has an important contribution to make to theology which its representatives do not begin to suspect.

In accordance with his remark that the new realism "needs criticism," Professor Macintosh proceeded to develop his own brand of realism, "critical monism," in *The Problem of Knowledge* (1915). He was then associated for a time with a group of philosophers who published their *Essays in Critical Realism* in 1920; but finding them on the whole too dualistic (*i.e.*, too agnostic) in their theory of knowledge, he abandoned this alliance, and went independently to work,

producing two books which may be considered to have launched the whole realistic movement in American theology: *Theology as an Empirical Science* (1919) and *The Reasonableness of Christianity* (1925).

The leading idea of the first of these books is that God, in the minimum sense of a "Dependable Factor" making unfailing response to man whenever man makes the "right religious adjustment," is as certainly real as are the objects of the natural sciences; and theology accordingly has as its chief task to explore, by methods roughly analogous to those of the other empirical sciences, what are the laws which govern the dependable operations of this divine Being. In the second book, which attracted much wider popular attention than the first, it was further agreed that it was reasonable and necessary to supplement these "scientific" (experimentally verifiable) truths of theology with religious postulates and speculative surmises, venturing out far in advance of the evidence, provided that such postulates and surmises were consistent with an attitude of "moral optimism;" *i.e.*, "a fundamental attitude of confidence in the cosmos, together with a full sense of man's responsibility," implying that "if man does his best, the Supreme Power on which he is dependent will do whatever else needs to be done[1]." Prof. Macintosh is thus led beyond his minimum concept of God as a Dependable Factor to a maximum concept of God as personal, world-controlling, self-revealing and self-giving in Christ.

The difference between these two books (a difference of emphasis only, be it understood, for the two are entirely consistent with one another) may serve to define the difference between Prof. Macintosh and the other leading pioneer of the realistic movement in theology, Professor H. N. Wieman of Chicago. With the central idea of *Theology as an Empirical Science* he is in profound agreement, as his own minimum definition of God and his confident theocentricity bear witness; with that of *The Reasonableness of Christianity* he is in profound disagreement. As a consistent realist, he feels conscientiously obliged to reject Prof. Macintosh's optimistic Kantian faith that "The God that man needs exists[2]." Not the God we *need* but the God we *find*, not the God in whom we *may venture to believe* but the God we *know and cannot escape*, is the object of his supreme devotion. He has used many different expressions to define this certain and inescapable divine Reality. Sometimes he refers to the "integrating process" or "value-making process" which one finds clearly described in General Smuts's *Holism and Evolution*, Lloyd Morgan's *Emergent Evolution*, or Hobhouse's *Development and Purpose*. Sometimes, under the influence of Whitehead, he pushes

1 *Reasonableness of Christianity*, 46.
2 *Ibid*, 76.

back of cosmic process to the ultimate structure of possibility which determines the process, and refers to God as the "principle of concretion" or the "order of existence and possibility" or even the "Ultimate Reality" which determines the greatest conceivable good[1]. Recently, he has hailed John Dewey's *Common Faith* with great approval. Always he avoids calling God personal, for he stresses the comprehensive scope of God's working and can conceive of no wider matrix than God, in which God's personality might have developed by interaction with environing conditions. To Prof. Macintosh this seems no better than a "behaviouristic theology," which refuses to penetrate behind cosmic behaviour to the soul of the world as behaviouristic psychology refuses to penetrate behind human behaviour to the soul of man. In their three-cornered discussion[2] of theism with Prof. M. C. Otto (a Humanist), Wieman and Macintosh found themselves continually at loggerheads; yet both can justly claim to be realists. Wieman confines himself more cautiously to observable phenomena; Macintosh feels himself justified in taking greater leaps of metaphysical inference and religious faith, while recognizing finally the same empirical court of appeal. Like Ritschl, he does not merely postulate the Christian God in Kantian style, but asserts that He is *found* by whosoever will make the "right religious adjustment."

The most important event, to date, in the history of realistic theology in America was the publication, in 1931, of a symposium called *Religious Realism*, edited by Macintosh. Of the fifteen contributors, several have already been mentioned in this article: Lyman of Union, Montague of Columbia, Wieman of Chicago. They represent a very considerable diversity of views, but are united upon the view that

> a religious Object, such as may appropriately be called God, exists independently of our consciousness thereof, and is yet related to us in such a way that through reflection on experience in general and religious experience in particular, and without any dependence upon the familiar arguments of epistemological idealism, it is possible for us to gain either (as some would maintain) adequately verified knowledge or (as others would be content to affirm) a practically valuable and theoretically permissible faith not only that that religious Object exists but also, within whatever limits, as to what its nature is[3].

An important feature of the book is its attempt to relate American religious realism with cognate movements, historic or contemporary. Thus Prof. Calhoun of Yale discusses "Plato as a Religious Realist," Prof. Bixler of Smith College (now of Harvard) discusses the relation of American religious realism to German "Phenomenology," and

1 For these and other definitions of God see his best-known work, *The Wrestle of Religion with Truth*. See also his article in the *Congregational Quarterly*, XI. 280-287.

2 Published under the title *Is There a God?*

3 *Religious Realism*, p. *v*.

Prof. Richard Niebuhr of Yale discusses its relation to the general contemporary revolt against "anthropocentric" and "anthropocratic" ideas. In the "faith-realism" of Paul Tillich he finds the closest point of contact between German and American religious realism at present[1].

The mention of Tillich should remind us that realism has its political as well as its philosophical side. In Tillich, and many other contemporary religious writers, there is a tendency to dissolve the alliance between Christian thought and nineteenth century political liberalism, with its optimistic trust in the soundness of democratic political institutions, and its belief in the possibility of steady progress through gradual adjustments, without sharp political crises. In America, since the war, it is noteworthy that the leaders of the "Social Gospel" movement have become sharply critical of their predecessors for having underestimated the difficulties of the task of Christianizing the social order. Reinhold Niebuhr, of Union Seminary, the best representative of this new leadership, is quite as devoted to the cause of social justice as Walter Rauschenbusch was; but he denounces as "unrealistic and romantic" the hope that Christian principles can ever be made to pervade the structure of society as they may be made to prevail in private life[2]. Accepting the Marxian doctrine of the class war, he sees no easy and peaceful method of passing from one social order to another, and is inclined to see "unconscious hypocrisy" in the Church's profession of neutrality and equal good-will towards all parties in the economic conflict. His influence upon Christian ethical and political thought in this country has tended to make it on the whole more pessimistic and less pacifistic. He calls himself a "tamed cynic." His is a very Christian cynicism, humble and contrite as well as accusing; but his mood of foreshortened hope in the possibility of social progress is certainly very characteristic of our times. Political realism like his is a very important part of the realistic movement in American theology.

Systematic theology, so far, is much less affected by the movement than is the general trend of religious and theistic discussion. That is not surprising. New movements of Christian thought generally begin in the field of apologetics or philosophy of religion, and work their way gradually out from the primary theological idea (God) through the whole circle of secondary theological ideas. The author of this article has just published a small book in which a preliminary sketch of a *Realistic Theology* is attempted. Other thinkers, it is to be hoped, will criticize, correct, and supplement these first stumbling suggestions, and create a theology of real scope and religious power.

1 See Tillich, *The Religious Situation,* translation and introduction by H. Richard Niebuhr.

2 See especially his *Moral Man and Immoral Society,* and his *Reflections on the End of an Era.*

For better or for worse, the era in which we are living since the World War is a realistic era, sceptical of "hopes" and "ideals," passionately craving contact with some objective "Reality" to which its trust and devotion can wholeheartedly go out. Unless a realistic theology can make clear the supreme claim of God, in Christ and the Church, to man's primary loyalty, that loyalty is likely to be bestowed upon some human idol—a deified Nation or glorified Class—which does not deserve it, and cannot permanently hold it.

From the standpoint of European theology, at least two objections to American realism are likely to be voiced: it is founded upon human reason instead of upon divine Revelation; and it attempts to "start from scratch" instead of building upon the achievements and learning from the vicissitudes of the Christian tradition. The first objection is most likely to be made by the German Barthians; the second, by British theologians. It must be admitted that both objections have real force and applicability. It is very characteristic of American theology, ever since Jonathan Edwards, to begin confidently to build its structure from the ground up, on freshly cleared land, according to some clean-cut rational plan, instead of rebuilding some ancient structure, as one inevitably does in Europe. It tends therefore to be unbiblical, unhistoric, even unchristian—which is not so likely to happen if a more traditional plan of procedure be followed.

But there is no reason, in the nature of the case, why a realistic theology should fall into these pitfalls. A consistent realist *must* take account of history and *must* recognize the actual limitations of human reason and experience. If then he honestly recognizes divine Revelation as a fact, he is bound to give it supreme significance in his thinking, and reverently to use the earthen vessels—the Bible, and Church tradition—in which the sacred treasure is contained. Unlike the Barthians, American realists are united in the view that human experience is not so completely earthbound, corrupt, and subjective that it can yield no gleams of objective divine truth; and so they do not disparage rational argument and "natural theology"; but many of them, like Prof. Macintosh himself, the founder of the school, believe that divine revelation speaks in the ear of faith many truths—and those the most important—which are not directly or simply discernible by unaided observation and experience. Empiricism in theology does not necessarily imply subjectivism or man-centredness. It is equally compatible with objectivism and God-centredness. Realism in theology does necessarily imply naturalism. It is compatible with any type of supernaturalism which can make good its claim to be solid fact and not wishful imagination.

WALTER MARSHALL HORTON.

WHAT SHALL I DO IF MY SON WANTS TO JOIN THE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS?

Among the most vivid of my pre-war recollections is the memory of the Officers' Training Corps at Uppingham carrying out its manœuvres and marching into the School Chapel for the Speech Day service in the radiant, ominous month of July, 1914. The members of the Corps on that brilliant summer's day included three young men who then represented everything that mattered most in a girl's limited but expanding world—the "Edward," "Roland," and "Victor" of *Testament of Youth*. After the War, like most of their companions in the Corps that morning, they did not return.

Since those days my views on the subject of Training Corps in public schools have become so definite that I cannot imagine any headmaster who advocates this insidious form of militarism as an education in "manliness" welcoming me as a desirable parent. Nor can I picture myself, if my own wishes were the sole factor to be considered, sending my son to a school which regarded the O.T.C. as anything but an antediluvian though dangerous form of killing valuable time.

But the upbringing of a child is never a simple, individual problem. The final decision is usually based upon a series of compromises; propinquity has to be taken into account, and the size of one's family, and the state of one's income, and the chance winning of a timely scholarship. Then, too, the child may himself develop, through the possession of some unusual talent, a strong and reasonable predilection for a school which would not have been, from another point of view, one's own immediate choice. Thus it may happen that I shall find myself, reluctantly but inevitably, sending my son to a school where the O.T.C. is regarded as a fine form of preparation for life.

To-day, at the age of seven, his opinions on militarism are confined to the ostensibly simple but actually very complicated proposition that "The War was very wicked, but the soldiers were good." Judging by the present condition of Europe, it seems quite possible that before he reaches public school age his views on the iniquity of War may have been violently reinforced by some new catastrophe which will blow both him and the rest of us into a premature eternity. Let us, however, suppose that an unexpected change in the international situation—the arrest of Hitlerism in Germany, or a sudden determination by the States that compose the League of Nations to use it for the purpose for which it was founded—averts for the present this undesirable contingency.

In that case it seems possible that, seven years hence or less, in

the full flood of youthful reaction against a pacifist parent, my son's desire to join his school O.T.C., strengthened by indirect pressure from masters and the crude contempt of conventional schoolfellows, may have reached the point of assertive persistence.

If this happens, I certainly shall not forbid him to join. My own schooldays are not yet too far distant for me to remember that a flat prohibition is the one thing calculated to fire an independent young mind with the determination to attempt, at all costs, the thing forbidden. But we will go into the whole matter rather thoroughly first.

With the idea of appealing to his reason, I shall begin by putting into his hands one or two books which present the arguments against the O.T.C. in a simple and readable fashion. One of these will certainly be Mr. Beverley Nichols's *Cry Havoc*; and another the forcible little manual by Mr. L. B. Pekin, *Public Schools*. From the first author's experimental visit to Marlborough, my boy will learn that headmasters and O.T.C. instructors not only disguise from themselves, by a kind of psychological ju-jutsu, the real objects for which the Corps exists, but in this process of self-deception deliberately render such training as they give ineffective by confining themselves to military methods which even before the last War were becoming obsolete, and would be worse than useless in the next.

From *Public Schools*, however, my son will learn still more, for Mr. Pekin goes thoroughly into the whole question in fifteen excoriating pages which have never, so far as I know, been successfully challenged. These pages make it quite clear that the "voluntary" character of the O.T.C. is associated with a species of moral coercion which amounts to "absolute compulsion," and leave no shadow of doubt with regard to its military intentions. Figures are given which show that the £120,000 a year contributed by this country to the "costly" League of Nations is easily exceeded by the £200,000 spent upon training schoolboys to prepare for War. A War Office report is also quoted to the effect that a certain series of statistics is

> intended to give an idea of the strength of the O.T.C. . . . . and of the extent to which it is fulfilling its object of providing a potential reserve of young officers and of officering the Territorial Army.

At the conclusion of this chapter Mr. Pekin suggests alternative methods of providing that "comradeship," "health," and "discipline" which my son's headmaster will certainly emphasize as being amongst the O.T.C.'s chief merits. I shall endeavour to increase my boy's knowledge in this respect by presenting him with the pamphlet, *Alternatives to the O.T.C.*, written by Mr. E. B. Castle, the Headmaster of Leighton Park, Reading; I shall also tell him something about the non-military physical training given to boys

in Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, and France, and describe to him the *Sokols* of Czechoslovakia, which organize their immense competitive gymnastic displays in connexion with the Trade Union movement.

But I know that, at fourteen, the appeal to reason is not enough. It is less effective than the appeal to the imagination, and this is better achieved by practical demonstration than by the most convincing arguments. So if the books fail, I shall next attempt what may seem a somewhat strange and inappropriate expedient. I shall take my son to that part of France where I worked during the great German offensive of 1918, and show him those Somme battlefields which I first saw when they were still an area of humped, dusty ruins and skeleton trees with jagged, accusing arms, and which I revisited after they had become a vast open-air museum, rich with harvest fields and rose-decked cemeteries, in August, 1933.

Together we will inspect the Australian Memorial at Pozières, and the Canadian Memorial at Courcelette, and the big Memorial on Thiepval Ridge to the Missing of the Somme, and read the inscriptions which decorate the cenotaphs.

"These," I shall remind him, "are the impression of War which you will get from belonging to your O.T.C.; you will be taught to think of it as a fine collection of dignified phrases, a sequence of noble words ringing melodiously down the long corridors of time. It meant this, I remember, in July, 1914, to three friends of mine who belonged to the O.T.C. at Uppingham—three friends who meant almost as much to me as you do—and who four years later were all dead, because they accepted the view of War that their instructors gave them.

"They, too, were accustomed to read uplifting phrases—in their school chapel. '*Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori.*' That was for the 'heroes' who fell in the South African War—a very different business from the last, which threw up some quite different inscriptions. Take, for instance, the one at Thiepval, beside which we are standing now:

> Here are recorded names of officers and men of the British Armies who fell on the Somme Battlefields July 1915 to February 1918 but to whom the fortune of war denied the known and honoured burial given to their comrades in death.

"We can't count their names because there are over 70,000 of them—just as there are 35,000 of the undiscovered dead at Arras, and 14,000 at Pozières, and so on. 'Their name liveth for evermore,' we're told—an inspiring thought for those whom the O.T.C. is training to emulate them. But what of the minds and bodies for which their names were merely labels?

"Have you ever visualized 70,000 missing men as the same number of severed skulls, with the brains which they contained poured

out upon the ground—those brains which we now need so desperately in every department of our public life; in our religion, our education, our literature, and our politics? Above all in our politics, which to-day seem so stagnant and so timid and so elderly, because the generation from which new leaders should have come cannot provide them. Have you ever imagined 70,000 distorted masks of faces floating on the surface of stained, muddy pools—or four times that number of smashed arms and legs still turned up yearly by the peasant's spade in the Valley of the Ancre, when the ground is dug deep after the beet harvest? And do you think that these memorials, telling their deceptive tale of death and glory to complacent, unimaginative historians, were really worth that anguish of fear, of suffering, of humiliating mutilation? Let us go home now and investigate rather more fully what lies behind these noble inscriptions."

At this point I shall take him back to England, and on the journey home I shall describe to him some of the men—and especially the German prisoners—whom I nursed at home and abroad between 1915 and 1919; limbless men, madmen with head wounds, men with distorted caricatures of faces. I shall quote to him, too, a letter that I wrote to my mother from Etaples in the fourth winter of the War, describing some of the first cases of mustard gas after the Battle of Cambrai:

> Sometimes in the middle of the night we have to turn people out of bed and make them sleep on the floor to make room for more seriously ill ones that have come down from the line. We have heaps of gassed cases at present who came in a day or two ago; there are 10 in this ward alone. I wish those people who wrote so glibly about this being a holy War, and the orators who talk so much about going on no matter how long the War lasts and what it may mean, could see a case—to say nothing of 10 cases—of mustard gas in its early stages—could see the poor things burnt and blistered all over with great mustard-coloured suppurating blisters, with blind eyes—sometimes temporarily, sometimes permanently—all sticky and stuck together, and always fighting for breath, with voices a mere whisper, saying that their throats are closing and they know they will choke. The only thing one can say is that such severe cases don't last long; either they die soon or else improve—usually the former; they certainly never reach England in the state we have them here, and yet people persist in saying that God made the War, when there are such inventions of the Devil about . . . .

And I shall add a few more relevant details, because I shall not be so tender to his feelings as I was to my mother's in 1917.

When we arrive home I shall take him to the Imperial War Museum, and we will look at the pictures by Orpen and Nash and Nevinson—pictures of gassed men, of men on the wire, of dead men with green faces decaying in the swamps near Ypres. Perhaps I shall even obtain for him, from scientific collections, some of the photographs of wounds inflicted by bombs and high explosive shells upon "the human form divine."

And if, by then, he protests that he has had enough, I shall explain that we have not yet finished. That was only the last War which we were investigating; there is still the next to consider. For after all, what the O.T.C. is really doing is to prepare him for that next War—not efficiently, so that he will be equipped to defend himself against it, but romantically, so that he will be psychologically inclined to accept it without knowing exactly what it means. Since they will not describe it to him in its incomparable horror, I shall have to do so myself. I shall explain to him that in the last War the use of gas—as Siegfried Sassoon has reminded us in his *Memoirs*—was only "in its infancy." Now that gas has become at least adolescent, we will examine together what its effects are likely to be.

I have several scientific friends, and I shall get them to talk to him without camouflage about the repulsive physical and mental effects of Lewisite and the latest varieties of blistering gas. He might also try—preferably when he has a bad cold—the experiment of putting on a respirator in the poison-chambers of Anti-Gas Ltd., and discovering its psychological effects upon himself. He can read the reports of the experts in such books as *What Would Be the Character of a New War?* If we have not already had the new War by then, there will be more experts and more books. Finally we will again show him some pictures. There was an interesting series, somewhere about the beginning of 1933, by a French artist named Zilzer, in the weekly review, *Time and Tide*.

We can turn up the files of this paper in the British Museum, and look at these visualizations of monstrous Frankensteins, insidiously stalking the streets of cities by night, thrusting tentacle-like vaporous fingers through doors and windows. We will inspect the pictures of babies writhing in their mothers' arms, and the final representation of a dead gassed soldier, with the poisoned tears still running down his cheeks. There will be more pictures, too, by then, but I do not think any editorial comment will ever be more effective than the one attached to this: "And the last enemy to be destroyed is death." It is the message which civilization is crying out to the new generation.

And when we have finally finished I shall say to him: "This is your choice. Are you really out to destroy life, or to join the forces which are trying to combat these diabolical forms of death? Your O.T.C., virile and romantic as it may well seem to you, is not, in the long run, on the side of life. You now know the logical conclusion of all forms of militarism, however innocent their beginnings may appear. If you still want to join the O.T.C., I shall put no obstacle in your way."

But if he is as intelligent as I believe him to be, I do not think that he will.

VERA BRITTAIN.

PAUL'S KNOWLEDGE OF JESUS.

It is common to regard St. Paul as possessing next to no knowledge of the earthly life of Jesus, and it is almost universally held that he had had no contact with the Jesus of the flesh. It is true that the Jesus Christ he presents most frequently is the exalted Christ, the Jesus of the Resurrection glory, pre-existent with the Father. And at one point in his letters he seems actually to pour scorn upon the knowledge of Jesus after the flesh. In *2 Cor.* 5^{16} he says, "Even if we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more." It seems at first sight to mean that the ordinary information a man might have obtained of Christ by sight and hearing is to be regarded as valueless for the Christian: the only vital matter is present and direct contact with the risen Lord.

Let us examine the saying for a moment. Is that a correct interpretation? We find from the context that Paul is discounting the same sort of knowledge which he may have had of any other person. "From now on," he says, "we know no one after the flesh." "Knowing after the flesh" obviously means the same thing in both clauses. But clearly Paul was not indifferent to ordinary information about other human beings. His letters, especially *1 Cor.*, prove that he took great pains to understand the practical every-day problems of his converts. As a pastor he was always careful about details, about recognizing special earthly relationships. He delighted in personal friendships. Clearly, therefore, the phrase applied to Jesus does not imply indifference to the facts of Christ's earthly life. "Knowing Jesus after the flesh" means for Paul looking at the facts of His earthly life without imagination or insight or spiritual vision. "Knowing Him no more after the flesh" means seeing Him at last with spiritually opened eyes, setting the facts of His life in the light of eternity and realizing their true significance. No doubt in part he does mean more than that: he means direct communion with Christ risen and glorified. But it was the historical Jesus who became Christ the glorified. And Paul does mean also making spiritual use of ordinary sources of information.

Again, when in *Gal.* 1 and 2 Paul claims that his Gospel was given to him directly, quite apart from the original disciples of Jesus, what he means by his Gospel is the underlying spiritual principles of God's way of salvation. And it cannot be held to imply that he was not indebted to original disciples for details of the Saviour's earthly career. For elsewhere he places some of the facts which he "received" as part of the basis of the message he preached. "For I delivered unto you among the first things that which I also received," he says in *1 Cor.* 15^{3}, speaking of the resurrection appear-

ances of Jesus. And the only legitimate interpretation of the word "received" is that he is referring to tradition which has been handed down to him by eye-witnesses. It is the tradition of the early Jerusalem Church, and almost certainly it is part of the information he got from Peter during his fifteen days' intercourse with him after his return from Damascus. No doubt Paul also claimed to be able to give his own independent testimony about the Resurrection. He sets the appearance of Jesus to him on the road near Damascus on the same level as the Resurrection appearances of Jesus to the disciples. But what he got from the vision of Jesus on the road to Damascus was not so much the facts as a new interpretation of the facts. There can be no reasonable doubt that he had known many of the facts about Christ before. But they had only served to rouse in him all his worst passions against the followers of Jesus. What happened on the road to Damascus was that Paul's spiritual eyes were wrenched open as by a lightning flash, and he began to see all the facts in an entirely new light, in the divine light of eternity. And when he began to see the man whom he detested because He had defied and broken the law of Moses and had in consequence suffered an ignominious felon's death,—when in the Damascus light he began to see Him as the Messiah, God's promised one, fulfilling a divine destiny of suffering and death for man's sin, surely no facts of Christ's life, such as Paul must have later frequently received from Peter or Barnabas or John Mark, or James the brother of the Lord, or from some of the 500 witnesses of the Resurrection, could possibly have been a matter of indifference to him. He must have been eager to use every opportunity of intercourse with Christ's early followers in order that he might reinterpret the whole earthly life of Jesus, that he might lift the facts up into this new light, that he might know not a fragmentary but a whole Jesus Christ after the Spirit.

Why is it, then, that so few of the facts of Christ's life are represented in the Epistles? I think the main reason lies in the purpose of these letters. They were not written to supply the facts of the Gospel, they were written to explain the Christian experience of Paul's converts, and to unfold the life they ought to live as followers of Christ. Paul's preaching which led to the conversion of his hearers, must have been couched in great measure in another strain. And we have many hints in the letters that it was so. No doubt it centred round the two great culminating facts of Christ's life, the Cross and the Resurrection. But the meaning of those two great facts must have remained dark to Paul apart from the character of the being who was the subject of these events. Paul, indeed, plainly tells us what the theme of his preaching was. It was "Jesus Christ and Him crucified." These words should be carefully noted. Christ was certainly the name Paul gave to his risen and exalted Lord.

But why does he in these words put the name Jesus before it? He does so to indicate that the person whom he called Christ and Lord is identical with the man who was known when he lived on earth as Jesus. It was not merely some glorified spiritual and eternal being in the Unseen Paul called on men to believe in, but a being who actually lived a man among men. "Jesus is Lord:" that is Paul's short and simple creed. "The Christ whom I trust and worship is the man Jesus who lived, suffered, died on the Cross a few brief years ago in Palestine." We are surely entitled to infer from that that Paul had much to say about the historic Jesus in his preaching.

And the Epistles are by no means devoid of reference to the historical facts of the career of Jesus. The many hints which they contain are enough to indicate how wide and intimate was Paul's knowledge of the life. Paul knew Jesus to have been a real man (*1 Cor.* 15^{21}), born of a woman (*Gal.* 4^{4}), a descendant of Abraham (*Gal.* 3^{16}), of the seed of David (*Rom.* 1^{3}, 9^{5}); knows of His baptism (*Col.* 2^{11}, *1 Cor.* 10^{2}), calls Him a minister of the circumcision, born under the law (*Rom.* 15^{8}); knows that He lived a life of poverty (*Phil.* 2^{4f}), that He was wholly obedient to God (*Rom.* 5^{18}), that He was betrayed (*1 Cor.* 11^{24}), that He instituted the sacrament of the Supper (*ibid.* ff), that He was crucified under Pontius Pilate, was buried and rose the third day (*1 Cor.* 15^{4}), that He bore the prints of the wounds in His hands (*Gal.* 6^{17}). He knows also of the preaching of the Kingdom of God, and of the sending forth of the apostles, and of their being given power over devils (*2 Cor.* 12^{12}, *1 Cor.* $12^{10, 28, 29}$, *Gal.* 3^{5}); knows the disciples were twelve in number (*1 Cor.* 15^{5}), that one was Peter, one John, one Judas; knows that James was the brother of the Lord (*Gal.* 1^{9}). He knows that it was the "princes of this world," not the people, who compassed the death of Jesus (*1 Cor.* 2^{8}). He knows of the reproaches of the crucified One (*Rom.* 15^{3}), His weakness on the Cross (*2 Cor.* 13^{4}), and of the nailing to the Cross of the handwriting of the proncosul (*Col.* 2^{14}). Above all, what he says of the character of Jesus, as one worthy of imitation (*1 Cor.* 11^{1}, *1 Thess.* 1^{6}), as one who humbled Himself as a man to take the form of a servant (*Phil.* 2^{4-8}), one animated with meekness and gentleness (*2 Cor.* 10^{1}), a man of tender, compassionate, self-forgetting, serving, self-sacrificing love (*2 Cor.* 5^{15}, *Gal.* 2^{20}, *Phil.* 1^{8}), an unselfish being (*Phil.* 2^{5ff}), not a self-pleaser (*Rom.* $15^{2, 3}$), voluntarily accepting poverty (*2 Cor.* 8^{9}), reveals a clear and consistent picture. Into his mind the impression of the man Christ Jesus had sunk deep and ineffaceable.

And as for the sayings of Jesus, apart from the new one quoted in *Acts* 21^{35}, "It is more blessed to give than to receive," Paul's letters are studded all over with references, direct and indirect, to these. Some of the commands of the Lord which he gives are obviously

references to things Christ said during His ministry. *E.g.*, the command about divorce (*1 Cor.* 7[10]), or about preachers living of the the Gospel (*1 Cor.* 9[14]), or Christ's words of institution of the Last Supper (*1 Cor.* 11[23ff]), or His word about those who died before the Second Coming (*1 Thess.* 4[15]) all go back to the days of the ministry of Jesus.

It would be an interesting study to go through Paul's letters and pick out the words and phrases that could be paralleled in Jesus' words. Let us note merely the most outstanding of them here. In *Rom.* 2[1] Paul says, "Wherein thou judgest another thou condemnest thyself": Jesus said, "Judge not that ye be not judged" (*Matt.* 7[1]). In *Rom.* 2[6] Paul says "He will render to every man according to what he has done": Jesus said, "He will reward every man for what he has done" (*Matt.* 16[27]). Again, when in *Rom.* 2[13] Paul says, "Not hearers of the Law but doers shall be justified," we are reminded of Jesus' words about hearing and doing (*Matt.* 7[24, 26]). In *Rom.* 2[19] Paul uses the phrase "a guide to the blind" which recalls Jesus' word, "blind guides of the blind" (*Matt.* 15[14]). When in *Rom.* 6[3] Paul speaks of Jesus' death under the figure of baptism, we remember that Jesus said of His death, "I have a baptism to be baptized with, *etc.*" (*Lk.* 12[50]). In *Rom.* 9[33] occur the words "a stone that will make men stumble" reminding us of "the stone which the builders rejected . . . everyone who falls on this stone will be broken" (*Matt.* 21[42f]). Again both Paul (*Rom.* 11[25]) and Christ (*Lk.* 21[24]) speak of "the fulness of the Gentiles." When in *Rom.* 12[14, 17, 19, 20] Paul says, "Bless them which persecute you . . . recompense no man evil for evil . . . avenge not yourselves . . . if thine enemy hunger feed him," we are reminded of the great passage about love of enemies in the Sermon on the Mount (*Matt.* 6[39-45]). When in *Rom.* 13[7] Paul says, "Render therefore to all their dues . . . tribute to whom tribute," we are pointedly reminded of Jesus' word: "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's" (*Lk.* 20[25]). In *Rom.* 13[8, 10] Paul says, "Owe no man anything but to love one another . . . Love never wrongs a neighbour," and again we are reminded of Jesus' word "Love thy neighbour as thyself" (*Matt.* 22[39]). When in *Rom.* 14[14] Paul says "there is nothing unclean of itself" we are forced to recollect Christ's passionate discourse in which He made all things clean (*Mk.* 7[15, 19]). When in *Rom.* 14[13] Paul says "Never put a stumbling block in your brother's way," we recall Christ's words about offending one of these little ones (*Matt.* 18[6, 9]). Again Paul's reference to the Kingdom as being righteousness, peace, joy (*Rom.* 14[17]) reminds us in some measure of the Beatitudes (*Matt.* 5[6ff]). In *Rom.* 16[19] Paul says "I would have you wise unto that which is good and simple concerning evil:" Jesus said "Be ye wise as serpents and harmless as doves" (*Matt.* 10[16]). In *1 Cor.* 1[27] Paul says "God has

chosen what is foolish in the world to shame the wise:" Jesus said "Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent and hast revealed them unto babes" (*Matt.* 11^{25}). In *1 Cor.* 6^{7} Paul says "Suffer yourselves to be defrauded"; "let him take thy cloak also" said Jesus (*Matt.* 6^{40}). When in *1 Cor.* 8^{10} Paul says, "Wound not the conscience of your weak brother," we are reminded again of Jesus' word about offending these little ones (*Matt.* $18^{6, 9}$). When in *1 Cor.* 13^{2} Paul speaks of having faith so that he could remove mountains, he is echoing a word of Jesus (*Matt.* 21^{21}). When in *2 Cor.* 11^{7} Paul speaks of abasing oneself so that others may be exalted, does he not have in mind similar sentiments of Jesus (*Lk.* 14^{11})? When in *Gal.* 4^{6} Paul speaks of the spirit of adoption whereby we cry Abba, Father, he probably has in memory Christ in Gethsemane crying Abba, Abba (*Mk.* 14^{36}). In *Gal.* 5^{14} Paul repeats Jesus' quotation of the second greatest law, Love your neighbour as yourself (*Matt.* 22^{39}). Again in *Gal.* 6^{2} Paul gives "Bear ye one another's burdens" as the very law of Christ. And *Gal.* 5^{13}, which speaks of serving one another in love, recalls Christ's picture of the servant (*Lk.* 22^{26}). When in *Eph.* 2^{20} Paul refers to the unseen heavenly Temple which is being built, it would appear that his figure goes back to Jesus as its source. When in *1 Thess.* 4^{8} Paul says "He that despiseth, despiseth not man but God," he is all but quoting Christ (*Lk.* 10^{16}). When in *1 Thess.* 5^{2} Paul speaks of the day of the Lord coming as a thief in the night, he is undoubtedly referring to a parable of Jesus (*Lk.* 12^{39}). When in *1 Thess.* 5^{5} Paul calls Christians "children of the light," he is using a figure of Jesus (*Lk.* 16^{8}). When in *1 Thess.* 5^{6f} Paul says "let us watch and be sober . . . ," he has in mind Christ's parable of the faithful and unfaithful servants (*Lk.* $12^{42\text{-}46}$). Again *2 Thess.* 3^{3} "to protect you from the evil one" may have a reference to the last petition of the Lord's Prayer (*Matt.* 6^{13}).

Surely then all this heaped up detail of reference to Christ's life, person, and teaching proves a much more extensive acquaintance with the facts of the historic Jesus than Paul usually gets credit for. And it raises this further question, Did Paul ever come into contact with Jesus in the days of His flesh?

When Paul tells us (*Acts* 22^{3}) that he was brought up in Jerusalem at the feet of Gamaliel, he brings it within the region of historical probability that he was a student in Jerusalem about the time when Jesus made his open entry into the city, and we are entitled to find in the assertion that he had known Christ after the flesh more than a mere unbelieving knowledge by hearsay of the facts of Christ's life, in fact a first hand contact and acquaintance with part of the public career of Jesus. Is there anything in the Gospels or Epistles that would seem to bear this out? It has been suggested that since the Cross is the summit point of the theology of the Apostle, in the

actual onlooking at the crucifixion of Jesus, while at enmity with the Man, lay the thorn in the Apostle's heart. However that may be, some close contact with the closing scenes would seem in part to account for the deep impression which the fact of the Cross made on the mind of Paul.

But attempts have been made to find a still earlier connexion between Paul the student and the Prophet of Galilee. One remembers that there were various deputations sent down from the Sanhedrin to Galilee to spy out the doings of the Prophet. It is thought to be unlikely that Paul was a member of these earlier deputations. Still, these deputations imply that rumours of the Galilean ongoings had reached the authorities in Jerusalem. They had been much talked of in Sanhedrin circles. And doubtlessly these early rumours had given Paul the student much heart-searching over the law concerning so-called prophets and dreamers of dreams. There are various indications in Paul's letters that *Deut.* 13 had more than once exercised his mind.

It has been more definitely suggested, however, that possibly Paul was actually a member of the deputation of Pharisees which came from Jerusalem to Christ in the Peræa and attempted to entangle Him over the question of divorce. It is even suggested that the genius displayed in the choice of a subject on which to challenge Jesus may lie to the credit of Paul. For in *1 Cor.* 7^{10f} Paul quotes what he calls a commandment from the Lord, which seems to reflect Jesus' words on the occasion of that deputation: "And unto the married I command, yet not I but the Lord, Let not the wife depart from her husband; but and if she depart let her remain unmarried or be reconciled to her husband; and let not the husband put away his wife." The only occasion on which Jesus laid down such an injunction, so far as the Gospels indicate, was the occasion of this deputation. And Paul speaks here with the authority of Christ behind him, as if he had received the injunction direct from Christ Himself (*cf. Matt.* $19^{6, 9}$). Does it not in a measure suggest that Paul was present with this deputation?

We seem, however, to come closer to the point of Paul's contact with the Jesus of history when we reach the closing days of our Lord's career in Jerusalem. Once more a deputation of Pharisees and Herodians came to Jesus in the Temple courts asking, "Is it lawful to give tribute unto Cæsar or no?" And it is not without significance that the word used for tribute in Luke's Gospel (20^{22}, 23^{2}) is φόρος, and that the only other place in the New Testament where the word is used is in *Rom.* $13^{(6)\ 7}$, where Paul seems actually to be echoing the reply of Jesus. There is no suggestion that Paul is quoting from a document containing words of Jesus, certainly not from Luke's Gospel, which was not written at the time of Paul's letter to Rome;

it is more like a spontaneous memory, as if he himself had heard Jesus' reply about the tribute money. Luke's version of this story may have been the way he was accustomed to hear it from the lips of Paul when Paul told the story.

Further, it was on this same occasion that Jesus uttered His fiercest denunciation of the Pharisees (*Matt.* 23), and one can hardly read *Rom.* 1 or 2 without finding there indirect reflections of Jesus' judgment of hypocrisy, as if the memory of that strong outburst of Jesus in the Temple courts had sunk deep, a barbed arrow into the heart of this strict Pharisee with the uneasy conscience.

It has been thought by some that when he says he received of the Lord the account of the Last Supper, he is referring to the time when, as an examining member of the body which condemned Christ, and in response to a direct question, he heard from Jesus' lips what took place in the upper room. While the reference to the night on which He was betrayed is suggestive, it is much more likely that Paul received the information from the lips of Apostles, not as a direct word of Christ.

It is urged against all this, that if Paul did actually come across Jesus, we should have had something much more definite and specific about it in his letters. Surely, however, it is not difficult to find a reason for this silence of Paul. Paul's conversion might be likened to a great explosion. And the spark that set the magazine ablaze was the tragic martyrdom of his fellow-student Stephen, in whose death he was a willing accomplice. Now it is noteworthy how silent Paul's letters are concerning this undoubted fact in his career. Once or twice in a vague phrase, such as "I did it in ignorance," is there a quivering of the lips that are otherwise sealed in horror and shame. Might not a similar reason partly discount for Paul's partial silence about contact with the actual events of Christ's life on earth? When he met the vision on the road to Damascus, and called the speaker "Lord," he seems to be betraying the fact that he is quite conscious who has apprehended him there. He recognizes this heavenly figure as identical with the man Jesus. For the voice said in his conscience it was Jesus of Nazareth whom he was persecuting. Did this young student of Gamaliel's, passing in and out of the Temple courts on Passion week, never see the excited crowd round a solitary speaker and draw near to learn what it was all about? Luke, the writer of the third Gospel, was for years a companion of Paul. Where did Luke get so many added details (found in his Gospel alone) of the Passion story? Is it so very impossible that Paul may have told him some? Let us return to the Temple courts. We have seen some slight indication of contact with Jesus in Paul's reference to paying tribute. Let us turn back to the day before in Luke's Gospel. Jesus, confronting his enemies, is uttering the solemn parable about the vinedressers.

"Now what will the owner of the vineyard do to them?" He asks. And answers, "He will come and destroy these vinedressers, and give the vineyard to others." It is Luke alone who reports the cry that follows from the listening crowd: "God forbid!" Whose voice is it that speaks? Among all the early Christian writers, there is only one who uses the phrase, and it is Paul. And he uses it frequently: it is a characteristic expression of the Apostle's (*Rom.* $3^{4, 31}$, $6^{2, 15}$, $7^{7, 13}$, 9^{14}, $11^{1, 11}$, *1 Cor.* 6^{15}, *Gal.* 2^{17}, 3^{21}). Was it Paul who cried out that day in the Temple courts? Read what follows in Luke's narrative. "Looking intently (ἐμβλέψας) on them" Jesus spoke. The word describes a searching penetrating gaze, and the only times it is used of Jesus are when He gazed on His disciples after the visit of the Rich Young Ruler (*Matt.* 19^{26}), when He looked longingly on the Ruler himself (*Mk.* 10^{21}), when the Lord turned and looked on Peter in Caiaphas's courtyard (*Lk.* 22^{61}), as well as when he looked on Peter at the re-naming in the Fourth Gospel (1^{42})—practically always when Jesus is intent on one particular individual and at a crisis in that individual's career. What particular individual is He singling out from the crowd here in the Temple Courts? Was it this young student who may have been the first to cry "God forbid!"? It looks as though the evangelist had got the information from someone who had met the glance of those keenly searching eyes. Who was it who was haunted by that look? Was it Saul of Tarsus? Listen to the words that followed from Jesus' lips: "Then what does this Scripture mean?—'The stone that the builders rejected is the chief stone now on the corner.' Everyone who falls on that stone shall be crushed, but on whomsoever it shall fall it will scatter as dust." It is an answer to the challenge of the lips that cried: μὴ γένοιτο. Was Paul never troubled by the haunting thought of the rejection of Israel in after days? Why, chapters 9-11 of *Romans* are all concerned with it. And in the end of chapter 9—in this very connexion—Paul quotes "They have stumbled over the stone of stumbling."

Then turn to the day of the Cross in Luke's Gospel. Who heard the prayer from that gallows-tree: "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do"? Who is this who is so glad to hear that men may be pardoned because in ignorance they did it? If it was Paul who heard the words, one can well understand the poignant anguish with which he listened to the echo of them on the lips of his fellow-student whom he watched being stoned: "Lord Jesus, lay not this sin to their charge." Who again heard the last triumphant cry from the Cross, which *Luke* alone records: "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit"? Was it the man who to his dying day must have been haunted by Stephen's cry: "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit"? And who witnessed the eleventh hour repentance of the

thief on the cross, and heard a word full of comfort and inspiration for him in later days: "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise"? Was it the man who was swept into a spiritual ecstasy (a Paradise on earth) by the crucified Nazarene on the road near Damascus? It surely sheds a flood of light on all Paul's thinking to suggest that he was present at Calvary. Many facts about Jesus he may have been ignorant of. But on two points he never falters nor wavers. He has a clear and consistent picture of Jesus' character. And he knew, as no one of his day knew, the power of the Cross. His letters are full of the Cross. The accursed thing has become his only reason for boasting. It was Jesus Christ—the historical Jesus who became the exalted Christ—he preached,—yes, and Him crucified.

The attempt has frequently been made to set Paul alongside Christ as the co-founder of Christianity; indeed it is sometimes thought that St. Paul has displaced Jesus and altered the entire incidence of the Christian message. But that is to ignore the fact that the central theme of the Christian message must ever be the Person of Christ Himself even more than what He taught. It was not Christ's vocation to teach a doctrine of reconciliation but to embody and work out in His own life and death that Divine act which was God's approach to men in reconciliation. It was for the subjects of that reconciliation to find expression for the experience it brought to them. This false view of the place of Paul in Christianity further ignores the fact of the utter dependence of Paul on Jesus for all that the Gospel meant to him. We may express that dependence in a series of obvious contrasts between our Lord and Paul.

For one thing, there is Christ's serenity of conscience contrasted with Paul's noble self-censure. Christ's love of His Father was a love which never began in a sense of debt; which never was clouded with doubt or with conflict; which flowed on in an uninterrupted tide to the end. Paul's love of God was a love which precisely did begin in a sense of debt—to God in Christ. He passed from the living death of a troubled conscience to life, by the grace which was his in Christ Jesus. His was the love of one chief among sinners. He remained a sinner redeemed, full of self-upbraidings to the end.

There is further Christ's perfect obedience to His intimate and unhesitating understanding of His Father's will contrasted with Paul's passionate gratitude for a will constrained out of disobedience. Christ—might one say without irreverence?—lived in the unbroken assurance of His Father's gratitude to Him. His was a perfect surrender to the Father's will; it was the surrender of one who had at once, without hesitation, without reserve, without any sense of unworthiness or inadequacy accepted the transcendent task. Paul's self-surrender was that of one who knew himself to be quite unworthy. It was the penitent gratitude and obligation of one who owed every-

thing, who could not "speak his thanks but offered up his life." Christ's call was primarily a call to seek the lost. Paul's was primarily a call to return from the lost estate. God was in Christ seeking the lost. His motive was a pure Divine compassion. Christ was in Paul healing the estrangement; his motive as a missionary was the constraint of a lost one who was found.

Christ's knowledge also contrasts with Paul's faith. Christ's intimacy with the Unseen was of absolute authority in all that concerns the revelation of the Father. Paul's attitude is that of trust in Christ's authority. Paul's convictions about heavenly things were the voice of the Holy Spirit speaking within him, which was always the voice of the Spirit of Jesus. Christ's convictions were the voice of underived authority.

Christ's moral power and perfection also is contrasted with Paul's consciousness of weakness. Christ was assailed with temptations on a higher plane than ours, but His will always walked firmly, calmly, triumphantly over them. Paul's life was a long fight with ordinary sinful flesh. His only hope of triumph was through the grace of Christ. Christ reached out a strong independent helping hand to the sinful. Paul approached sinners as one who had himself a grasp of Christ's hand.

These contrasts between Paul and Christ stand disclosed in their most personal words of self-revelation. When Christ said "I am" He revealed Himself: "I am the Bread of Life," "I am the Light of the world," "I am meek and lowly in heart. Take my yoke upon you," "I am come to cast fire on the earth: would it were already burning," "The Son of man is come . . . to give His life a ransom for many," "I am the Way."

When St. Paul said "I am," he confessed Christ. "I am chief of sinners," "I am less than the least of saints," "I am the least of the apostles," "By the grace of God I am what I am," "I am dead to the law," "I am crucified with Christ," "I am not ashamed of the Gospel," "I am debtor," "I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present nor things to come, nor height nor depth nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

J. A. Robertson.

This is, however inadequately expressed, a sketch of some aspects of the story of one who has been always an eager seeker of the truth about problems of the universe and of human destiny, and who has had vicissitudes in the quest. Apart, however, from the strictly personal side—though every life has a meaning—the principles involved in the problems discussed are such as have permanent importance.

That the problems of existence are mysterious few will deny. "From my childhood," said Descartes in the *Discourse on Method,*

> I have been familiar with letters; and as I was given to believe that by their help a clear and certain knowledge of all that is useful in life might be acquired, I was ardently desirous of instruction. But as soon as I had finished the entire course of study, at the close of which it is customary to be admitted into the order of the learned, I completely changed my opinion. For I found myself involved in so many doubts and errors, that I was convinced I had advanced no farther in all my attempts at learning than the discovery at every turn of my own ignorance . . . . When I considered the number of conflicting opinions, touching a single matter, that may be upheld by learned men, while there can be but one true, I reckoned as well-nigh false all that was only probable.

Or, as Cicero (*On the Nature of the Gods*) had remarked, centuries before Descartes:

> Simonides, who was not only a delightful poet, but reputed a wise and learned man in other branches of knowledge, found, I suppose, so many acute and learned arguments occurring to him, that he was doubtful which was the truest, and therefore despaired of discovering any truth.

What is truth? Can we have any ultimate certitude? If we can, where shall we find it? The *Welträthsel* being so mysterious, is it strange that many people are attracted if they have presented to them the claims of some great, historic organization which professes to be able to give such certitude? This article is the story of one who in his youth was thus attracted. As an individual story it is unimportant: but (as already remarked) any personal narrative may be significant if related to vital principles.

My own family, and my ancestors so far back as I have been able to trace, were Free Churchmen of the type of Evangelical Baptists and Congregationalists. On my mother's side they were descended from adherents of the Commonwealth cause in the times of Oliver Cromwell. One natural result of this heredity is that I have been always a lover of freedom and progress.

However, I had during boyhood little definite theological instruction. It was all disconnected, unsystematic, based on little logical foundation. The Divinity of Christ and other dogmas I was

accustomed to, but with no reasoned basis of credibility. I learnt no formal Creeds. Is it, then, surprising that, yearning for brightness, beauty, and certitude, I became unhappy in this environment? I had a bias towards a kind of romanticized mysticism, and, my early home-life being somewhat lonely, was an omnivorous reader of books of variegated types. I was fascinated by the old Greek myths; I was fond of Bunyan, the *Arabian Nights,* and other highly imaginative literature (Bunyan, I fear, rather as a tale than as a work of religion), and I learnt large parts of Milton's *Paradise Lost* by heart, revelling in its stately verse and terrific imagery, but with a very imperfect idea of its theology.

With these unformed religious notions, and never having been a member of any Church, I left school. It was in the first years of the present century, and the militant campaigns of Rationalism and the "New Theology" were in full force. Haeckel's *Riddle of the Universe* was selling in thousands; the strong though somewhat crude anti-Christian propaganda of Mr. Robert Blatchford was creating an enormous sensation; the "New Theology" was drawing crowds to the City Temple in Holborn.

Is it surprising that I was deeply affected by all this controversial turmoil? A boy of sixteen, unattached to any Church, untrained in any really reasoned theology, but deeply interested in such matters: would he not be roused inevitably by the disputes around him? I read all the iconoclastic literature that came my way: Haeckel, McCabe, Blatchford, Leslie Stephen, Mill, and others. It is to be feared (though psychologically the fact is understandable by reason of "the charm of what is novel") that I tended more to rely on the literature of the "rebels" than on that which favoured established beliefs.

This youth of sixteen or so, then, was being swept away from even such basis of belief as he had inherited. Yet in his heart he felt there was "something wrong" with the uncompromising anti-religious campaign. This "something wrong" I felt mainly in regard to the bearing of the matter on *morals.* If this brief earthly life is our all; if we are ruled by "iron laws" and have no freedom of will, then what is the meaning of right and wrong? A deep depression came upon me, as it had come on Professor Romanes ("Physicus") and is expressed thus in his *Candid Examination of Theism*:

> Forasmuch as I am far from being able to agree with those who affirm that the twilight doctrine of the "new faith" is a desirable substitute for the waning splendour of "the old," I am not ashamed to confess that with this virtual negation of God the universe to me has lost its soul of loveliness . . . . The precept *know thyself* has become transformed into the terrible oracle of Oedipus: "Mayest thou ne'er know the truth of what thou art."

In this state of depression it was of little use to me to read, from anti-religious writers, such assurances as this[1]:

> There is infinitely greater satisfaction in working for ideals which may be, and will be, realized on earth than in living for a visionary happiness and perfection which are supposed to lie beyond the dark portals of the grave in
>
> the undiscover'd country, from whose bourn
> No traveller returns.

What "ideals" are any real good (I asked myself) if ultimately everything is dark death and mere decay?—if a man, as Mr. G. K. Chesterton, opposing the deterministic denial of free-will, expressed it[2], a man

> may not have his own soul. Every thought that comes into his head he must regard as the click of a machine. . . . He walks in wide fields under a splendid sunrise; he resolves on some vast magnanimity—Click! what is the good of sunrises and palaces? Was ever slavery like unto this slavery?

I do not suggest that, at an age of less than twenty, I really understood these matters: but I experienced distress similar (in nature, if not in degree) to that of Bunyan, of which Macaulay wrote:

> From those abodes (of the Delectable Mountains) he was shut out, and placed in a dark and horrible wilderness, where he wandered through ice and snow, striving to find his way into the happy region of light.

What would be a natural—possibly not inevitable, but at any rate understandable—result of such an *impasse*? I was "temperamentally theological" (if so crude a phrase be excusable); it seemed intolerable to me that the solution of *die Welträthsel* should be found in mere "naturalistic Rationalism;" but what to believe I did not know. Looking back over an interval of thirty years, I now realize that my youthful emotions were simply reacting against the stress of problems I was too young to understand. Rationalism as *mere negation* is one thing; Rationalism as the legitimate use of reason as against arbitrary authority is another. I confused the latter with the former, and, in reaction, turned to the search for some infallible religious guide.

Mr. W. H. Mallock was then popularizing his version of Roman Catholicism as such a guide. "Being," he said[3],

> endowed with a single brain, the (Roman) Church is endowed with a single historic memory . . . . Is doubt thrown on the Resurrection and Ascension of Christ? The Church of Rome replies, "I was at the door of the Sepulchre myself. My eyes saw the Lord come forth. My eyes saw the cloud receive Him." Is doubt thrown on Christ's miraculous birth? The Church of Rome replies, "I can attest the fact, even, if no other witness can; for the angel said 'Hail!' in my ear as well as Mary's."

1 *Mr. Balfour's Apologetics Critically Examined* (anonymous), 66-7.
2 In a symposium, *The Religious Doubts of Democracy*, 109.
3 *Doctrine and Doctrinal Disruption*, 192, 197.

This is rhetoric: and the mental attitude it expresses replaces historic evidence by blind faith. The idea it conveys, however, is attractive: that of a perpetual, visible, audible teacher of divine truth. The reading of Mallock[1] brought me to a decision to seek reception into the Roman Communion. I applied, then, at St. Benedict's Church, Ealing, and, after a period of catechetical instruction, was formally "received" on 17th December, 1907. In the Profession of Faith (substantially the Creed of Pope Pius IV) the convert declares:

> I believe the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, Roman Church to be the one true Church established on earth by Jesus Christ: to which I submit myself with my whole heart.

If the convert has certainly been baptized before (for the Roman Church recognizes baptism, "even by heretics," as valid if the proper "matter and form" have been employed), he is not baptized; if there is doubt in the matter, "conditional baptism" is given; if it is clear that the convert has never been baptized, he receives unconditional baptism. The last-named was the case with me.

The eager enthusiasm of the neophyte now seemed to have led me into a charmed region. Here we come to an analysis of facts, and a point of view, which are very necessary to be understood if it is desired to see the inner reason and cause of the powerful hold which the Roman Catholic Church has over so many of its members. The explanation of that reason and cause, indeed, is the justification of the writing of this article. The narrative of the experiences of one individual may seem unimportant. The underlying principles, however, are of vast moment; for, dominating the lives of millions, they have influenced nations for centuries.

Those who desire to understand the Roman Catholic Church must realize, first and foremost, its claim to be *unique*. It does not, of course, deny that truth exists in other religions and schools of thought: but it asserts itself to be the only legitimate teacher of Divine Revelation, and the only body which teaches that Revelation fully. The Roman claim is[2]:

> To each new sect the Church could say: "*Prior veni*: I was here before you: I, not you, have received the commission to teach and rule the nations."

On the devotional side there are the sacraments, devotions, guilds, *etc.*, which keep the people together both spiritually and socially.

> He (the Catholic) lives in a different world from other men. Different dwellers are round about him, and are his familiars: God, Jesus, Mary, Angels, and Saints[3].

1 Mallock, in his *Memoirs* (p. 205), records that various people have told him that he led them to "Rome." He himself, however, never took the step. Advice he gave to others he neglected to apply to himself!

2 Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, 179.

3 F. W. Faber, *Growth in Holiness*, 258.

The devotion to the Blessed Virgin and to Saints would itself distinguish vividly between Roman Catholics and Reformed Christians. It is very real and vital. The famous hymn, *Vergine Madre, figlia del tuo Figlio,* with which Dante begins Canto 33 of the *Paradiso*—

> Thou Virgin Mother, daughter of thy Son,
> Humble and high beyond all other creature, ...
> Here unto us thou art a noon-day torch
> Of charity, and below there among mortals
> Thou art the living fountain-head of hope,—

is a genuine expression of Roman Catholic feeling. The Blessed Virgin, and the saints, are regarded as intercessors for spiritual and even (indeed, often) for temporal benefits.

Into this charmed world, then, I, an inexperienced youth of twenty-two—insufficiently learned, insufficiently cognisant of the world; romantic, enthusiastic—entered. I went to confession and communion often; I joined the Guild of the Blessed Sacrament and, some years later, the Jesuit Sodality for laymen; I was surrounded by the vivid social life of an active (and largely Irish) parish; I used with fervour such devotions as the Rosary and the Way of the Cross; and, I may add, I encountered one personal and very special incident of affection which left—though it "came to nothing"—a lasting memory. Having some facility of writing, I engaged in press-controversy in defence of the faith, and, after the war, promoted a definite scheme of "Catholic Press Defence." I wrote largely in the "Catholic press." After the War, I joined committees for the defence of "Catholic interests." Devotionally, intellectually (for, granting its basic assumptions, the Roman Catholic Church has a deep philosophy), emotionally, and socially, I was in the *cadenas de oro* of a unique religious Society.

In September, 1908, the International Eucharistic Congress was held at Westminster. There was a special Papal Legate, and bishops, priests, and laity came from many parts of the world. To the great culminating outdoor procession every church which possibly could sent a contingent. As I have said elsewhere[1]:

> Such events do not pass easily from the memory. I shall never forget the Congress of 1908: nor the friends with whom—we all rejoicing and zealous—I walked afterwards from Westminster to Liverpool-street. Where are those friends now? Wherever they may be, peace to them!

That Congress is associated in my mind with the abortive romance mentioned above. I shall never forget that and other times of mingled zeal and romanticism.

The essential fact about membership of the Roman Catholic Church is that it is "all or nothing." If, in the mind of one of its

[1] *The Reformation, Catholicism and Freedom,* 174.

members, disbelief exists of even one doctrine which has been defined as an article of faith, such person is *ipso facto* excommunicate: he cannot receive absolution unless he dismisses the doubt or disbelief. If the disbelief express itself openly, the excommunication becomes an overt fact. *He is cut off from all the life described above.*

Ironically, the very zeal with which—in the press, on committees, and in other ways—I entered into the defence of Roman Catholicism, was destined to lead to such an estrangement. In this brief article it is impossible to give details: moreover, they have been given in a book[1]. Suffice it to sum the matter up thus:—My reception into the Roman communion had not caused me to cease to be a candid student, appreciative of both sides of questions; and to a great extent the arguments against the Roman position were known to me. However, we may have (to use Newman's phraseology) a "notional" knowledge of facts—a "study" knowledge,—but may lack a "real" sense of their meaning unless some vivid circumstance brings such realization. In and about 1923-4 I advocated a more sympathetic attitude to those exterior to "Rome," and, in general, tried to promote more liberal modes of thought. Yet at that very time, on various Catholic committees, I met (amidst much good and useful work) a spirit of obscurantism. Again, a closer study of Papal encyclical letters led me to form an opinion that principles of freedom of conscience and intellectual honesty, which seemed to me to be fundamental to truth, are not merely regarded with disfavour by, but to a large extent are even condemned by, the Roman Church. Disillusionments of this type resulted in my coming to look from a different point of view on the arguments against the "exclusive claims of Rome." In the end (after a mental struggle during three years) I felt I could not maintain belief in those claims. Such a conclusion meant separation from the Roman fold (December, 1926). It was to me a terrible break. I had to

> go forth companionless,
> . . . Among new men, strange faces, other minds.

"A terrible break!" The real "inwardness" of that phrase should be realized. All old associations had to go. Indeed, I would emphasize, as one of the lessons of narratives like this one, that association with an autocratic system like "Rome" may produce on a life so intense an effect as *to mar it* if disillusionment comes at a late period. One grave problem which at once confronted me was a renewal of the same one which, so many years before, had been the cause of my original attraction towards "Rome." I mean that which was dwelt on so eloquently by Mallock: a bewilderment caused by the variety and contradictions of the religious bodies outside "Rome." I wrote one or two books, and many articles in periodicals, detailing

[1] *Rome at Close Quarters.*

my experiences of the Roman Catholic Church, and elaborately stating the arguments against her claims: but I had found no adequate substitute for what I had lost.

Discerning people will understand the desolation of such a position. A person placed in it would have an irrepressible yearning for the old associations from which he had parted, even though such parting had been a genuine consequence of intellectual causes. Man does not live by logic alone.

I was wandering, then, as in a wilderness. There can be no doubt whatever that, when in early youth I had joined "Rome," I had idealized that Church very highly: tending (as has been the case with so many others) to regard it—to adapt William Morris's words written in quite another connexion—as

> . . . an isle of bliss
> Midmost the beating of the steely sea,
> Where tossed about all hearts of men must be.

That idealization had caused me for years to place the deepest possible sense on the ecclesiastical devotions, so that they became parts of my life. Even after the intellectual break from the doctrinal claims had come, the spiritual attraction remained. Was it strange, then, that I should entertain the thought "Can a way back be found?" Influenced by kind words of Catholic friends, who, it is to be feared, realized very inadequately the force of the intellectual reasons which estrange people from "Rome," eventually I devised this process of reasoning (or, rather, as now is clear, it would be better to call it "rationalization": "finding arguments for what the heart desires"): "The evils which have existed, and continue to exist, in the Roman Catholic Church, can be attributed to the defects of its human members, and a rigid distinction can be drawn between them and what is claimed to be the divinely ordained unity and mission of the Church." On this basis I thought it possible (in July, 1933), without withdrawing any of my published statements of fact as to "the evils in the Church," to resume communion[1] with that devotional and sacramental life which in former years had been so dear to me.

It is here needful to comment, though reluctantly, on what really seems a rather strange procedure. When I applied for reception back into the Roman communion, I was not treated as an "apostate," but was dealt with in exactly the same way as a new convert. No questions were raised as to intellectual difficulties, or as to published writings against the Church. All that was done was to go through the Catechism to see that I knew its contents, and then to ask me to make the profession of faith exactly as before. The trouble about this process is that it does not touch the real root of matters. The

[1] See the *Modern Churchman*, November, 1933; *The Universe*, July-August, 1933; and the *Catholic Gazette*, August and September, 1933.

"apostate" (for, technically, that—or, at any rate, a "heretic"—is what I was) is left, by this procedure, to devise his own intellectual justifications for returning. Such a method is very dangerous: for the validity of what he does is left to depend on his private reasonings. Of course, the Roman Catholic authorities know their own business best, it may be presumed; but it really does seem that it would be better not to treat seceders who desire to return as though they are new converts who had never been in the Church. Such a method may make things easy: but, at the same time, it is very perilous.

In my case, I have to record that the result—and that a very quick result—was a complete disillusionment. The radical fallacy of which I allowed myself to be a victim (and for which I take full blame) is to imagine that it is possible to roll back the course of years. It is not possible to eradicate the results of twenty years' experience, and to return to the spiritual condition of a period before such experience was gained.

No sooner was I back in the Roman communion than I found myself immediately in contact with the very same things which had driven me out on the previous occasion. There was the obscurantism; there was the fact that the evils which had driven me out are as real as they ever were. I have no reason to complain of any personal unkindness. On the contrary (with one or two exceptions), I received kindness. But to be an orthodox Roman Catholic one must defend —or acquiesce in—so much that is intellectually indefensible. The formula about "attributing the evils to the merely human membership of the Church," is merely a theory for the study. It will not work in practice.

For example: The late Pope Leo XIII was an indefatigable writer of encyclical letters. In these epistles he treated not merely of theology, but also of most of the social problems of the day. Amidst much that is excellent, we also discover in his encyclicals condemnations of liberty of conscience, of freedom of the press, of freedom of opinion; and we find it laid down that[1], while the Church acquiesces in many modern liberties,

> She does not approve them, but tolerates them till happier times when she may exercise her own liberty,

such liberty including the right of "judging and punishing" and of discouraging State-recognition of other "religions (as they call them)".

It is an ingenious "study-theory," that the evils, which estrange free minds from "Rome," are "due merely to its human members"—but it will not work. The defects are too closely knit to the Church's framework. In the study one may attribute such declarations as those

[1] Leo XIII, encyclical *Libertas*; Leo's letters have been reaffirmed by subsequent Popes.

of Leo to the "non-infallible" category of Papal utterances: (as is *now* done in the case of the condemnation of Galileo). In real life, however, the spirit of such utterances is too real: and Catholics never criticize living Popes, whatever they may do to dead ones? When "Father Jerome" recently wrote a little book advocating a degree of liberalism in regard to "reunion" he had to do so anonymously, the Catholic press unanimously condemned his little effort, and eventually he had to leave the Society (that of the Jesuits) of which he was a member.

So it was not long ere I found that the emotions of the past had misled me. In July, 1934, candour compelled me to write to the Catholic press saying that the attempt to return had been a mistaken act. Only one of those papers, *The Tablet,* was frank enough to insert the letter, though all had given publicity to the mistaken attempt to which it referred.

That attempt had been inevitable, since, but for it, the emotional yearnings would have persisted indefinitely, whereas the final disillusionment has left one mind now really free.

The moral of such "pilgrims' progresses" as that described here is plain enough: Do not expect, in this life, too great a degree of certitude, for such expectation can but mislead. Do not exalt any institution, however great, to a position of pre-eminence, but make reason the test of all claims of any institution.

J. W. Poynter.

It is amazing in what specious pursuits an ingenious man will engage when he becomes a Roman Catholic. How the Arnold Lunn of ten years ago would have riddled the pages in which the doped Arnold Lunn excuses slavery in *A Saint in the Slave Trade* (Sheed & Ward, 6s.). It is instructive, too—and amusing—to compare the view of the Jesuits held by one who has just become a Roman Catholic with that, say, of Mr. E. Boyd Barrett, who has been a Jesuit. And does Mr. Lunn really believe that leaven works slowly?

Nevertheless, there are parts of the book which are very attractive. Mr. Lunn would have shown himself a greater artist if he had let Peter Claver's story speak for itself: the sacrifice of a life like Claver's with its complete self-abnegation is more convincing than the best of arguments. Born in 1581, Claver spent 38 years labouring among the slaves of South America, meeting the vessels when they arrived, ministering to the needs of the suffering and dying, kissing their sores, and in every way trying to bring them to his Lord and theirs.

The translation of Vol. II of Father Pierre Coste's *Life and Labours of St. Vincent de Paul* (Burns, Oates, 21s.) is now published. Father Coste is the leading authority on the life of the great Frenchman, and has already published the Saint's correspondence in eight volumes. Much research has gone to the making of the biography, the size of which may be judged by the fact that this volume alone runs to 500 pages.

EXTEMPORE PRAYER IN THE CONGREGATIONAL TRADITION.

> As he that feels the pain need not be learned to cry, even so he that hath his understanding opened by the Spirit needs not so to be taught of other men's prayers, as that he cannot pray without them. . . When David had the pains of hell catching hold on him, and the sorrows of hell compassing him about, he needs not a bishop in a surplice to learn him to say, "O Lord, I beseech thee deliver my soul!", or to look into a book to teach him in a form to pour out his heart before God.

Thus Bunyan in *Praying in the Spirit* expresses what has become the typical Nonconformist attitude to read prayers.

In this paper I am primarily concerned with an exposition of our principle of extempore prayer, but we must not allow ourselves to suppose that Nonconformist history offers us a uniform tradition in this matter, still less that our sponsoring of extempore prayer involves the necessary repudiation of any use of written forms in public worship.

I

Amongst our early Separatist forefathers there is evidence of a passionate outpouring of extempore prayer[1], but it would appear that at other Separatist gatherings it was customary to use the Genevan Service Book[2]. Thus we know that in 1588-9 no less than nine ministers are named as having been guilty of performing worship according to the "Form used at Geneva[3]."

Similarly it would appear that at the meetings of the Westminster Assembly there were Independents who opposed even the Introduction of a Directory of Public Worship[4]. On the other hand, the attitude of the Nonconformist ministers at the Savoy Conference is quite plain. They write to the King:

> We are satisfied in our judgments concerning the lawfulness of a liturgy, or a form of public worship; provided that it be for the matter agreeable to the Word of God, and fitly suited to the nature of the several ordinances and institutions of the Church; neither too tedious in the whole, nor composed of too short prayers, unmeet repetitions or responsals; not to be dissonant from the liturgies of other reformed

1 See Deposition of Clem. Campbell, *Harleian MS* 7042, p. 15, quoted in E. R. Micklem, *Our Approach to God*, 143, also *Relics of the Puritan Martyrs*, 26ff.

2 See Strype, *Grindal*, Bk. I, c. 10, "The Examination of certain Londoners" in Grindal, *Life and Remains*. But were these our forefathers? They were, perhaps, extreme Puritans rather than Brownists. But Congregationalism is a river that has been fed by many streams. Our strength and our weakness come largely from the fact that we have in us a Calvinist strain and an Anabaptist strain.

3 Strype, *Whitgift*, III, 278. See Baird, *On Liturgies*, cc. VII and VIII.

4 See Hetherington, *Hist. of the Westminster Assembly*, c. III; Neal, *Hist. of the Puritans*, II.

> Churches; nor too rigorously imposed; nor the minister so confined thereunto, but that he may also make use of those gifts for prayer and exhortation which Christ hath given him for the service and edification of the Church.

Accordingly on behalf of the Nonconformist ministers Richard Baxter drew up a form of Service to be alternative to the Book of Common Prayer[1].

Congregationalism has for the most part adopted the sole use of extempore prayer; but that only extempore prayer is legitimate or worthy in the public worship of the Church is scarcely to be regarded as a Congregational principle, as witness the publication by the Congregational Union of a *Book of Congregational Worship* and the testimony of such typical Congregationalists as Silvester Horne and J. H. Jowett and P. T. Forsyth. Indeed, well as it is that we should exercise and stir up the gift of extempore prayer amongst us, we could not deny the lawfulness of worshipping with a book without repudiating our ancestry in Wittenberg and Geneva and denying the inspiration of the great days of the Reformation. On the whole, it would seem that our fathers have always valued and practised the gift of extempore prayer, that they have always denounced *bondage* to any written form of words, and that their recent customary exclusive dependence on extempore prayer has been a reaction from the rigidities of the Act of Uniformity, not a repudiation of Reformation practice.

Constantly we find the protest of the fathers against "a set and stinted (*i.e.*, prescribed) form of words," against what John Robinson calls the "dumb ministry" of the Book of Common Prayer and the Homilies[2]. But even John Owen, protagonist as he is of extempore prayer, is prepared to justify the Prayer Book in the early days of the Reformation in England as useful; even in his own day it is not so much to its use as to its arbitrary imposition as indispensable that he objects[3]. He protests against uniformity, but unity, which is no unimportant matter, may well be safeguarded and preserved by "confessions of faith and acknowledged forms of wholesome words" (XV. 28); a common directory is as proper and convenient as a common confession (IV. 248); but that the Church should be tied to a particular and unalterable form of words implies a quenching of the Spirit, a sin against "the purity, simplicity, and spirituality of

1 It may be said that Baxter and his companions were not Independents; but certainly the Ejected Ministers are amongst the fathers of modern Congregationalism.

2 I have consulted, in particular, *A Justification of Separation from the Church of England*, by John Robinson (1610); *A Discourse concerning Liturgies and their Imposition* (1662), *A Discourse Concerning the Holy Spirit* (1674), and *A Discourse of the Work of the Holy Spirit in Prayer* (1682), all by John Owen; *A Guide to Prayer*, by Isaac Watts.

3 *Works*, XV, 30-34.

evangelical worship." The argument is one of fundamental principle: for the operation of the holy Spirit in prayer "is the hinge on which all other differences about divine worship do turn and depend" (IV. 254).

John Robinson, it appears, had likewise no objection to a directory; indeed, as he indicates, we are given such in the Lord's Prayer itself. In preaching the minister takes a text from Scripture and enforces it with respect to his congregation's needs; similarly in public prayer he takes as his text the Lord's Prayer or some part of it and enlarges upon it in relation to the particular worshipping congregation. He pours scorn upon the use of a book of prayers in Church, for, as he says, what father would not be ashamed to use a book at family prayers? It is very important to note that the repudiation of read prayers presupposes always a certain spiritual temperature in minister and people. Extempore prayer is justified as proper to the believing congregation alone; its exercise, as we shall see, presupposes a supernatural gift promised by Christ. It is not extempore prayer as such but extempore prayer in the Holy Spirit which is the matter for which the early Congregationalists contended.

Extempore prayer is frequently preferred by Free Churchmen on the ground that there is more "reality" about it. That "reality" in public prayer is pre-eminently necessary all will agree, but in this matter, says Dr. W. B. Selbie[1],

> the question as between a liturgy and free prayer, or between speech and silence, of which so much is made, is really irrelevant. Both may be equally boring and equally repellent.

But that there is, or may be, a particular vividness, power, and divine splendour about extempore prayer, none that have experience of it will deny. Says John Owen:

> As to the object of prayer, or things prayed for, he (the Holy Spirit) doth in and by the word so represent and exhibit the truth, reality, subsistence, power, and efficacy of spiritual, mysterious things, unto the faith and affections of believers, that they have a real and experimental sense of, do mix faith with, and are affected by, those things now made nigh, now realized unto them, which, it may be, they are not able doctrinally and distinctly to explain in their proper notions. And thus do we ofttimes see men low and weak in their notional apprehension of things, yet in their prayers led into communion with God in the highest and holiest mysteries of his grace, having an experience of the life and power of the things themselves in their own hearts and souls; and hereby do their faith, love, affiance, and adherence unto God, act and exercise themselves[2].

We must be ready, if need be, to sacrifice beauty to reality, elegance to power. "There are some," says Isaac Watts,

> that are dear to God, that can but chatter and cry like a swallow or a

1 *Faith and Life*, 86.
2 *Works*, III, 439f.

crane, as Hezekiah did, yet are in the lively exercise of the grace of prayer[1].

It is frequently argued, not without some justification, that extempore prayer is preferable on the ground that the splendid liturgies of the past breathe the atmosphere of the Court while our simpler prayers are alone appropriate to the home, the family of God. As John Robinson puts it, a child asking bread of its father does not take a paper in its hand, but speaks simply and directly to the father. There is force in this, but the argument must not be pressed too far. It not infrequently happens in a human family that, when the members have clubbed together to give a present to their father, some token of affection, perhaps, upon his birthday, they "make an occasion" of it, they approach him with some affectionate solemnity, they appoint a spokesman, who makes a little speech. The question is not how Christians *may* approach their heavenly Father, but with what manner of words it best becomes them to address Him when together they come to offer their sacrifice of praise and prayer.

The fathers at least were far from thinking that slip-shod, familiar, careless speech was suitable in prayer. Indeed John Owen argues that read prayers must be put aside because of the awful solemnity of the occasion; formal words of a liturgy must ever be inadequate to the soul-searching experiences of the believing Church's worship.

> I confess, men who scoff at edification and deride spiritual gifts . . . that suppose the whole baptized world converted to God, and preaching itself, on that account, less necessary than formerly at the first plantation of the gospel; that esteem the doubts and temptations of believers as needless scruples, and their sedulous endeavours to grow in grace and the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, labour lost in hypocrisy; that perhaps . . . suppose they can discharge the duty of the ministry by a bare reading of the service-book to their parish, by themselves, or by some hired by them so to do, . . . may think light of this consideration: but those who know the terror of the Lord, and anything of their own duty will be otherwise minded[2].

II

But not yet have we come to fundamental principles. It was given to John Owen to work out the theological basis of the Congre-

[1] A correspondent to whom I showed the foregoing paragraph comments thus:

> The common contrast is made between the roughness of extempore prayer and the literary beauty of liturgical prayer. It is made by both parties; but I think it obscures the vital issue. (It is so easy to get a rousing cheer from our Philistines by saying that we prefer truth to beauty!) But, as I see it, the cogent argument for *verbally prepared* prayer is not primarily æsthetic at all; it is that in public prayer spoken words are the medium of thought and emotion, and right words are necessary to give clarity to thought and to stimulate emotion and direct it towards its proper object. Good writing is better than bad, not simply (or even primarily) because it gives æsthetic pleasure instead of pain to those who are cultivated, but because it is indefinitely more effective for achieving its object of conveying thought, stirring emotion, rousing the will, *etc.* Good writing is extremely difficult, and many disciplines are required for its achievement. Precisely the same is true of good speaking—whether in address or prayer.

This is not, and is not meant to be, a criticism of that which John Owen asserts above, but it is very relevant to current Free Church thought and practice.

[2] XV, 54.

gational preference for extempore prayer. In reading him it is well to remember that he wrote in the heroic age of Nonconformity, and that his *Discourse Concerning Liturgies and Their Imposition* was published in the very year of the Act of Uniformity. What his principles imply for an age of Anglican anarchy and Nonconformist rationalism is matter for further consideration. Owen lays down, as it seems to me, three basic principles:

(1) It is not for man to interfere with God's ordering of His worship; the imposition of a fixed liturgy is "contrary to the rule of the word and consequently sinful" (XV. 33); "the command is general, 'You shall add nothing to what I have instituted'" (XV. 40f). In other words, Scripture is the sole rule of practice in the Christian Church. The Jews might add nothing to the ordinances of the Old Testament; Christians to the ordinances of the New. The New Testament knows nothing of liturgies and book-prayers, therefore they are forbidden to Christians.

This is a clear and intelligible principle. How do we now regard it? As Protestants we are committed to the view that nothing can be required of Christians either in faith or conduct without Scriptural warrant; but that no practice or custom in public worship is even permissible without direct Scriptural warrant we should be disposed to regard as unreasonable in itself and as a denial of the possible operations of the living Spirit in the Church. Nor does Owen himself press his principle to extremes:

> As for this work of making or composing forms of prayers for ourselves, to be used as prayers, there is no command, no institution, no mention in the scriptures of the Old Testament or the New. It is a work of human extract and original. . . A blessing possibly there may be upon it. . . I do not urge these things to prove forms of prayer unlawful to be used[1].

Further, many modern scholars would be disposed to add that in fact there was from the first a liturgical element in the Church's worship, at least in the administration of the sacraments. But, if Owen's principle requires to-day some modification, it is not for that reason unimportant nor lightly to be set aside.

(2) His second principle is: "the great rule of Gospel administrations is, that all things be done to edification" (XV. 50); the reading of prayers may be more æsthetically satisfying than extempore prayer, but it is less edifying. The Church is edified by the stirring up of spiritual gifts; the effect of extempore prayer is more searching, more inspiring, than liturgical worship; it should therefore be preferred.

This great principle, which is so proper to Puritanism, is open to serious question. Even if it be admitted that the moral and spiritual effects of extempore prayer are superior, the question is not settled;

[1] IV, 342.

for, as R. W. Dale says in another context, "prayers are primarily intended to affect God—not man." The Rev. E. R. Micklem in his recent study[1] lays it down that "the essential act of worship is *the bringing of a gift.*" The worshipper comes first and foremost to bring his offering of praise and devotion and self-oblation. Worship is an end in itself, not a means to a further end. That there is no true worship which does not issue in communion with God, in the spiritual enrichment of the worshipper, in the edification of the Church, and that these results may be used with caution as a test of the reality and value of the worship may be admitted; but if we say that the goal of worship is edification, we mistake the consequence for the end. It may well be maintained that extempore prayer is a better medium than a liturgy for the conveyance of the Church's worship. But the principle that the end of worship is edification is in itself unsatisfactory and is presumably responsible for the horror of prayers that have seemed addressed to the congregation.

(3) Owen's third principle is that

> there is a spiritual ability given unto men by the Holy Ghost, whereby they are enabled to express the matter of prayer . . . in words fitted and suited to lead on their own minds and the minds of others unto a holy communion in the duty, to the honour of God and their own edification[2],

that Christ according to His unfailing promise gives to the Church every gift it needs, including this frankly supernatural gift of praying in the Spirit, that the reading of book-prayers is, therefore, a quenching of the Spirit and a denial of the living presence of Christ with His people in the Spirit. Congregationalism derives from the charismatic ministries of the New Testament.

By some this principle is repudiated as a heresy of enthusiasm, by others it is accepted without any great understanding of its import. It is not extempore prayer as such but extempore prayer in the Spirit for which Owen contends. Many extempore prayers in Church have as little relation to the praying in the Spirit as the careless recitation of Mattins.

> I do not think that the Spirit worketh supplications in us by an immediate, supernatural, divine afflatus, so as he inspired the prophets of old, who ofttimes understood not the things uttered by themselves . . . but I do say . . . that the Spirit of God doth graciously, in the prayers of believers, carry out and act their souls and minds in desires and requests, which, for the matter of them, are far above their natural contrivances and invention. And he who hath not experience hereof is a greater stranger unto these things than will at length be unto his advantage[3].

"The best prayers," says Bunyan[4],

1 *Our Approach to God,* 34.
2 IV, 302.
3 III, 398.
4 *Op. cit.*

> have often more groans than words : and those words that it hath are but a lean and shallow representation of the heart, life, and spirit of that prayer.

One of the early Separatists, presumably John Greenwood, wrote :

> The Spirit that striveth against the flesh saith unto us, why yield unto the fleshly and mistrusting motion, for I will help thee ; go unto prayer, and I will guide thy words and tell thee how to pray, and what to say, and to whom, and in whose name ; and I will make thee to be full of great sighs and groans, which care not to be expressed ; but he that sent me to thee to make thee cry Abba Father, he knoweth the meaning of the Spirit in thee.

This kind of prayer presupposes the religion of the Puritans and the believing congregation. This is plain from John Owen's description of the matter of it ; it is a crying out for deliverance from unbelief, an appeal for the satisfaction of needs unspeakable, a pleading of the promises of Christ, a veritable wrestling with God (IV. 296ff). Where there is such prayer in such a congregation, no apologia is necessary.

It is of importance to notice that the vindication of extempore prayer is intimately bound up with the Congregational conception of the Church as the fellowship of the redeemed. "He is a Christian," said Robert Browne, "which is redeemed by Christ unto holiness and happiness for ever and professeth the same by submitting himself to His laws and government." The gathered Church met for worship has from Christ a sufficiency of all things needful for its worship ; the invention of litanies was a falling away ; we are summoned to what Owen calls "an humble returnal unto a holy, evangelical dependence" on Christ Himself (XV. 28) ; Christ ever fulfils His promise to give to some brother the gift of inspired utterance in prayer whereby, transcending his own limitations of knowledge and experience, he is enabled to voice the praises, confessions, aspirations, and longings of the whole community. The preaching of the Word belongs to the prophetic office of the Holy Spirit ; the extempore prayer to the priestly.

It is plain that for himself John Owen had a contempt for all books of prayers (IV. 341), but his opposition to book-prayers was not fanatical. He protested in the name of Christ and His Church against the arbitrary imposition of fixed and unalterable forms of worship in the Established Church, and he vindicated the charismatic ministry of prayer in the Church ; but he argued temperately with those who would vindicate a liturgy from their personal religious experience of blessing through it (IV. 345ff) ; he agreed that the mediation of written prayers might be useful and lawful, though it is nowhere commended in Scripture (IV. 348) ; so, too, he admitted that the composition of forms of prayer intended to be "directive and doctrinal helps" to others was useful and lawful, though he wished these compositions were not in the form of prayers (IV. 347) ; he did

not condemn the use of written prayers in private devotion, nor even without qualification in public worship (IV. 239ff; 342f), but he insisted upon the duty and privilege of extempore prayer. His objection to forms was that they quenched the Spirit; but if on any occasion a form did not quench the Spirit, there could be no objection to it:

> That only is a form of prayer unto any which he himself useth as a form; for its nature depends on its use[1].

III

In the next century Isaac Watts wrote *An Humble Attempt towards the Revival of Practical Religion among Christians, and particularly the Protestant Dissenters* (1731). The heroic age had passed; a relatively arid period had set in. John Owen could mentally contrast the vivid, glowing, exuberant life of a separated Church's worship with the drabness, tameness, barrenness of Mattins and Evensong; Isaac Watts confronted with a very different situation offers somewhat different counsel. Man needs and may expect the help of the Holy Spirit both in preaching and in prayer, but up to a point men may be taught both how to preach and how to pray.

> As the art of medicine or healing is founded on the knowledge of natural principles, and made up of several rules drawn from the nature of things, from reason and observation; so the art of preaching is learned and attained by the knowledge of divine principles, and the use of rules and directions for explaining and applying divine truths; and so the holy skill of prayer is built on a just knowledge of God and ourselves, and may be taught in as rational a method by proper directions and rules[2].

John Owen could never have written thus—unless, perhaps, he had lived in the age of Isaac Watts.

In order to attain the gift of prayer which, says Watts, "is one of the noblest and most useful in the Christian life," we must avoid these two extremes, on the one hand "a confining ourselves entirely to precomposed forms of prayer," and on the other "an entire dependence on sudden motions and suggestions of thought". It is with the second of these, as being *prima facie* inconsistent with John Owen's principles, that we are here concerned.

> Some persons imagine, that if they use no form, they must always pray extempore, or without any premeditation, and are ready to think all free or conceived prayer is extemporary; but these things ought to be distinguished.

By free or conceived prayer Watts means prayer when we have thought out the substance or matter but not the precise words of it beforehand. By extemporary prayer he means our prayer

1 IV, 350.
2 *A Guide to Prayer*, c. II.

> when we without any reflection or meditation before hand address ourselves to God and speak the thoughts of our hearts as fast as we conceive them. [This] is most properly done in that which is called *ejaculatory prayer* when we lift up our souls to God in short breathings of request or thanksgiving in the midst of any common affairs of life;

there is a place for it also in public worship, but a limited place.

Language that is permissible in private prayer, says Watts, may be "very improper and disagreeable in public." He agrees that men "of great heavenly-mindedness" may need less premeditation than others, and that a minister must be free from his premeditation, but

> I am ready to suspect that some persons, who are unskilled in praying, and yet cry out against premeditation, so indulge a degree of spiritual sloth, that secretly prevails upon them, while they profess to be afraid of any thing that comes near to a form.

Watts points out that many prayers in Nonconformist churches in his day "have given great offence to the pious, and been a stumbling-block and scandal to the profane," and have, moreover, confirmed Anglicans "in their confinement to liturgies and prayer-books."

> Due preparation for prayer is the way to serve God with our best. But for younger Christians, unskilled in this work, to rush always into the presence of God in solemn prayer, without due forethought, even when there is time allowed for it; and to pour out words before God at all adventures, is no sign of that high reverence which they owe to so awful a majesty, before whom angels veil their faces, who is jealous of his own worship, and abhors the sacrifice of fools.

The preparation commended by Watts is not merely in respect of spirit and substance but also in some degree of words and phrases:

> Treasure up such expressions especially as you read in Scripture, and such as you have found in other books of devotion . . . if so be we take care not to confine ourselves to them constantly, lest formality and thoughtlessness should grow thereby . . . though the limitation of ourselves to a constant set form of words be justly disapproved, yet there is great use of serious, pious, and well-composed patterns of prayer, in order to form our expressions and furnish us with proper praying language. And I wish the assistances that might be borrowed thence were not as superstitiously abandoned by some persons as they are idolized by others.

I see great difference of temperament and circumstance but no real difference of principle between John Owen and Isaac Watts. Isaac Watts would whole-heartedly consent to Owen's charismatic conception of the ministry, and Owen would have written differently had he not been living in an "age of faith." R. W. Dale's sympathies were wholly with John Owen, but he raises one issue which, so far as I know, was not discussed by Watts and Owen. He briefly

considers responsive worship such as the familiar suffrages now so widely used in Congregational churches or litanies to the clauses of which the congregation makes audible response. Such worship did not appeal to Dale, but he concedes that

> for those who really pray more earnestly when they take an "active and audible" part in the worship, a form of worship is clearly preferable[1].

In other words, the use of responsive services, unless they should involve a bondage, is a matter rather of psychological preference than of Congregational principle. There is much to be said for responsive worship in a day when the preacher's task is to rouse the people out of their passivity.

IV

I will venture in conclusion a few comments in the light of modern Congregationalism.

First, we stand for a charismatic ministry of prayer as of preaching. We believe that by the power of the Holy Spirit a man in preaching may be so lifted out of himself that his words are the medium of God's coming to the souls of those who hear; we believe that by the power of the same Holy Spirit a man in praying may be so lifted out of himself that his words become the very embodiment and expression of the needs and aspirations, the unspoken petitions, the half-realized longings Godwards of the congregation. Such preaching and such praying are by divine inspiration; they belong to the supernatural office of the Spirit in the Christian community.

Must all praying of this kind be necessarily extempore and wholly unprepared? It would seem that it is not so. No Christian minister can come to lead a Service *wholly* unprepared, even though no words have been thought out beforehand. The miracle (for it is such) occurs, whether in preaching or in prayer, when by a divine *concursus* the holy Spirit of the living Christ is in such wise joined to the minister's words that it is Christ Himself who speaks to us in the preaching, or Christ, our Great High Priest, who by the Spirit prays with us and in us. A preacher who is tied to his notes is indeed in bondage, but a man is not a better preacher of the Gospel the less he comes prepared. So also in prayer freedom is not the opposite but the correlative of preparation; a man can hardly be too well prepared provided that he is free to every motion of the Spirit in the Church. I see no reason in logic why a man should not take notes of his prayers with him to the pulpit as he takes notes of his sermons. Some men find great help and advantage in this practice; others find prayer almost impossible on these terms. This seems to me a matter

[1] *Manual of Congregational Principles.*

of habit or psychology, not in any degree a matter of Congregational principle[1].

Congregational feeling is against "read prayers" as being the opposite of "praying in the Spirit." This instinct is commendable, if it be remembered that the distinction is not absolute. John Owen's principle is sound: "that only is a form of prayer unto any which he himself useth as a form; for its nature depends on its use." Evensong may be sung or read, but it may also be prayed. No written prayer may properly be used in our churches as a form, but that no written prayer may ever be prayed, whether it be read or recited, is of bondage, not of liberty.

The miracle of the Word of God preached with convincing power, the miracle of the congregation welded into one by the inspiration of the minister as he pleads with God in their name and on their behalf, is not, as we are bound to confess, a miracle twice repeated every Sunday in all our churches. The Spirit bloweth where it listeth; Christ's promise to His gathered faithful people is not a promise to any miscellaneous congregation. Congregational principles "do not work," as we say, unless there be a company of true believers. We cannot command the descent of the Holy Ghost with power. But we have a principle of freedom. It would be a selling of our birthright if ever we should entangle ourselves in the yoke of liturgical restriction. It is the enormous advantage of our liberty that in language, thought, and scope our services can be relevant to the particular congregation and the particular occasion.

Our true liberty, however, would not be circumscribed, but rather increased, by the acceptance of a common Directory of Public Worship which like a common Confession of Faith serves the purposes of unity. A Directory preserves the universal element in the worship of the Church; thus it lays down no words that shall be used, but it requires, for instance, that at every service God shall be praised, though the minister be in a despondent mood; that sins shall be confessed, even though the minister do not feel penitent; and the foreign mission work of the Church shall be remembered in prayer, even though few in the congregation earnestly support it. This is not a restriction but an enhancement of freedom because it delivers from the merely arbitrary, temperamental, or individual.

[1] A correspondent writes:

Is not further thinking required about the action of the Holy Spirit? May not He inspire the minister preparing the prayers beforehand? And may not men differ in regard to the conditions which make them sensitive to the Spirit? It is an advantage to be able to think best "on your feet"; but many able and "inspired" speakers are not gifted that way. Does not the power of true extempore prayer depend upon this gift of ability to think on your feet? Is not the question, therefore, a psychological, not a pneumatic one?

I agree with my correspondent provided it be made clear that even the minister who does not readily "think on his feet" must ever be prepared to throw aside his prayer-notes or his sermon-notes that at the immediate quickening of the Spirit he may directly speak to his people in God's Name or speak to Him in theirs.

Again, the freedom of a Congregational Church is a freedom to sing the suffrages and intone the Lord's Prayer, to adopt the *Book of Congregational Worship,* or *The Rodborough Bede Book,* or any such "forms" should they be found helpful, provided only they are proper to the occasion and in harmony with evangelical theology. Uniformity in such matters is not desirable in Congregational churches, and for many churches there may well be occasions when some deviations from our dominant tradition serve the interests of piety and devotion. But the idea that we can revive religion in our Churches by any liturgical devices is a sad illusion.

It is always to be remembered that our great testimony to "prayer in the Spirit" springs out of the great evangelical experience and the evangelical faith. Extempore prayer may itself become a form, a superstition, and a bondage. The Anglican liturgy may always be preferable to Nonconformist free prayer, except when the latter by some divine touch of the Spirit soars, in its urgency and vividness, its relevance and passion, into a region that must transcend every "set and stinted form of words." Nonconformity fails, not because its language is rough and common, but because, when that Spirit is lacking which makes all things new, the mellow and hallowed words of ancient liturgies are more affecting, subduing, and comforting in their influence than careless and uninspired and vulgar speech. It is a good thing to glory in our tradition of "praying in the Spirit," but it is a spiritual impoverishment if we are unable by sympathy and understanding to enter into the experience of those of our fellow-Christians who find in liturgical worship not bondage but liberty. Let Thomas Binney expound to us the excellencies of a liturgy[1]:

> In free prayer, the minister has to do what is equivalent to his making a public revelation of himself; he has literally, as it were, to set forth before the people his naked soul, in whatever condition it happens to be, or, which may be far worse, he is tempted to present it as in a condition in which it is *not*. . . I can easily conceive that this (his disquiet) may be felt in exact proportion to the realized nearness and presence of God—to the truthfulness and depth of a man's piety. . . . Now, publicly authorized forms of prayer are a refuge here. The most intense expressions of all kinds may occur—of self-abhorrence, shame, contrition—of faith, joy, rapture—and the advantage is that no man is supposed, not even the minister, to utter, in these, his special individual feeling, or to reveal to others his then professed spiritual condition; what is heard, is the proper and fitting utterance of the faithful, everywhere and always, and, under cover of that, each soul gives to the general voice of the Church, as far as it can, a particular application to itself. . .
>
> An extempore prayer is the prayer of one heart, moved by and expressing its own life; and though . . . because of the identity of the Christian life in all Christian men, it will be what others would say in

1 *Are Dissenters to have a Liturgy?* being the Appendix to the English edition of Baird, *A Chapter on Liturgies.*

> proportion as it is genuine and true, *when uttered in the hearing of numbers and for their use,* it must be designedly so constructed as to meet many different conditions of mind. This fullness and variety is just what a well arranged Liturgy would provide. . . A book can be conscious of no profane exposure of itself, and can suffer none of that deleterious, reflex action which follows the conscious or unconscious use of exaggerated or simulated expressions of feeling.

This passage occurs in a dialogue and must not be taken to express Binney's final judgment. I venture one comment. The virtue of extempore prayer is that it offers expression to the immediate needs, aspirations, and conditions of this particular congregation at this particular moment. But there is another aspect of worship to which it ministers less readily. There is a worship of the universal Church in heaven and on earth that is never silent for an instant—the glorious, immemorial, unceasing praise of God. This worship far transcends our personal experience and hushes to silence our transient anxieties, our petty wants and troubles. It is perhaps the greatest privilege given to man on earth to participate, though it be but afar off and from the outermost fringe, in the solemn and triumphant worship of the universal Church. This is hard to attain if the minister's words are limited to his own experience and the immediate needs of the passing moment. We must have the personal, the local, the particular, but we must also have the universal, the timeless, the impersonal, and heavenly. I do not say that a liturgy is necessary for this, but most necessary is a sense of the worship of the Church universal, the transcending of the limits of the local, the temporary, and particular.

Now let Dr. Binney speak of extempore prayer:

> Where the minister is what he ought to be, there is more likelihood of his *exciting* devotion by free prayer than by the use of familiar forms, however unexceptionable and excellent in themselves. I have heard prayers which have gradually kindled, elevated, and enlarged the souls of the wrapt yet subdued people, by their solemnity and richness, in a way which was utterly indescribable, but which no Liturgy that was ever framed could possibly effect! The heart has been touched and softened; all sorts of emotion called forth; the truths of the common faith, implied in every sentence, have been brought before the mind with luminous clearness, and made to act with a penetrating power; penitence, faith, hope, joy, with all other corresponding sentiments, have been evoked and sustained; the invisible has been revealed; the world has disappeared; the presence of "the Comforter" has seemed a consciously felt reality! Such seasons are "times of refreshing from the presence of the Lord," when the assembled Church feels "the powers of the world to come."

That has been our experience—if rarely, yet sometimes. It is for this reason that free prayer is by us cherished as one of Christ's most precious gifts of the Spirit to His Church. It is a prerogative and privilege we never can forgo.

V

Taught and saddened by the lessons of experience, I shall not be surprised to find that this paper is represented as an attack upon our traditional modes of worship and an attempt to introduce liturgies into Congregational Churches. To avoid misrepresentation, so far as possible, I will briefly sum up my own conclusions from this very inadequate survey.

1. Never in any circumstances could we bow our necks under the yoke of a rigid and unalterable liturgy.

2. Never in any circumstances could we abandon the right and privilege of free, spontaneous, extempore prayer quickened by the living Spirit in the Church.

3. We cannot delude ourselves into supposing that all is well with the worship of our churches as a whole. No liturgical dodges will of themselves kindle the divine life in us. Our supreme need is for a revival of the evangelical faith and evangelical experience. Whether on occasion we do or do not use "forms" is a matter of quite secondary importance. But we are called to a serious reconsideration alike of our principles and of our practice. We have not given enough thought to what public worship is and ought to be.

4. Preparation is not less necessary for prayer than for preaching. Whether that preparation imply writing or memorizing or merely praying is a matter for the individual minister.

5. There is much to be said on certain occasions and in certain churches for a responsive element in worship wherein minister and people join vocally.

6. The adoption of a suitable liturgy or the use of collects and written prayers is not in itself inconsistent with our principles provided that it is not binding and leaves room for extempore and spontaneous prayer.

7. Should I myself welcome the general introduction of liturgies or liturgical forms into our Congregational worship? I should neither welcome nor regret the decision of Congregational churches which are free, and for whose needs I am not able to prescribe. I had occasion recently to worship in a church where the minister uses liturgical forms for part of the Service. In that church those forms seemed to me not only beautiful but fitting and right. I have no wish whatever that they should be abandoned. I worshipped for some considerable time with a church where the minister would often lead us in a collect and in place of the traditional long, unbroken prayer would guide our intercessions. I am sure he was very carefully prepared; I am sure also that he was open to the guidance and inspiration of the present Spirit. There is nothing there that I

would wish to alter. When I was first ordained, I had the immeasurable privilege of being the young colleague of Arnold Thomas in Bristol. He possessed in singular measure the graces and gifts of the Holy Spirit and, in particular, the gift of vocal prayer. In his presence and under his leadership I cannot imagine myself desiring anything but our traditional modes of public prayer. But I remember that during the war he introduced a liturgical element into our morning services at Highbury, and I recollect that he once remarked to me (he had been attending a service, I think, in Clifton College Chapel) on how much we Nonconformists miss in our ignorance or neglect of the Prayer Book services. So we do; but when he was present to sweep us heavenwards upon his prayers there was no loss of which we could be conscious. I could not imagine Dr. Horton ever using a book in public prayer, nor can I imagine myself ever wishing that he should.

8. Where the minister seems to be denied the special gift of inspired vocal prayer, and where he comes into the pulpit virtually unprepared, and where in prayer he voices only the rambling reflections or aspirations of the moment, those churches (if such there be) would do better to use the *Book of Congregational Worship* or Dr. Hunter's or some other.

9. I am sure, too, that we should seek to lose any obsessional and morbid fear of forms and books. I myself am helped by responsive services, but that is a personal matter, not a principle.

10. Apart from responsive services, where they are desired, I see little need for books, provided the minister comes dutifully and adequately prepared. What form his preparation can take no man dare prescribe for him. But, after all, the great times in our churches are when by some descent and rapture of the Holy Ghost the minister is given such utterances in prayer or sermon that the congregation is welded into one in the heavenly places and joins "with angels and archangels" being "lost in wonder, love, and praise." I have the deepest sympathy with those who fear or reject all alterations in our now traditional ways lest such experiences become less frequent and the Spirit be quenched. I am sure that, if the spiritual tides rose in our churches, these experiences would be much more frequent than they are. But, after all, we cannot compel this inspired gift of the Holy Ghost. We are not denied the presence and power of Christ where this gift is withheld. No, we cannot compel the descent of the holy fire; but we can build the altar and lay the sticks. That is the minister's preparation.

NATHANIEL MICKLEM.

L.E.L.—A CENTURY-OLD TRAGEDY.

In the Uffizi Gallery in Florence hangs one of Botticelli's most famous pictures, that known as *Calumny*. The subject was taken from a lost painting by Apelles, a description of which is contained in the writings of Lucian, but it is treated with a power and passion that leaves no doubt in the mind of the beholder that the fierce feuds and factions of Florentine life urged the artist to its execution. Upon a richly decorated throne sits a Judge; Ignorance and Suspicion whisper in his ears while Calumny, an imperious figure, drags to his feet her helpless victim, Innocence. In the background stands Truth, disregarded by all; her gaze is turned upwards and she points to Heaven, where juster judgments are passed than those of earth.

> To those who to indulge a small envy, or a miserable love of gossip, talk away my life and happiness, I only say—if you think my conduct worth attacking it is also worth examining. Such examination would be my best defence.

This sentence from a letter, written in the year 1835, recalls a tragedy of which Botticelli's *Calumny* might well be the symbolic representation, when a young and gifted woman was attacked by the combined forces of Ignorance and Suspicion and, having been dragged before the bar of Public Opinion, became the victim of a mysterious doom.

Letitia Elizabeth Landon, the bright particular star of Annuals and Books of Beauty, is looked upon in the present day as a typical example of facile and shallow poetasters, and modern undergraduates would not only laugh her verses to scorn, but would probably refuse to believe the statement of Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton that in his Oxford days the members of the Union fell over one another in their eagerness to see if a new poem of hers appeared in the Saturday issue of the *Literary Gazette*. But though the poetess has ceased to charm, the woman has not ceased to interest, for there is something in her story akin to Greek drama—the blows of Fate are unexpected, it is from the blue sky that the thunderbolt falls.

The early years of L. E. L.'s life gave no hint of disaster. Born in 1802, she was the daughter of John Landon, who was prosperous enough to have two homes, a country house at Barnet and a town house in Chelsea. This latter was in Hans Place and it was at a school near by, kept by a Mrs. Rowton, that the child had her first lessons and charmed her teachers by her quickness and intelligence. Mary Mitford was one of her schoolfellows and it was from the hands of Lady Caroline Lamb that she more than once received a prize at the annual presentation. The names carry the mind back to so far distant a world that it seems almost incredible that her brother, the

best loved of her playfellows, did not resign his benefice until 1877 and died so near our own day as 1883. It was to him that she addressed the lines descriptive of her childhood:

> Do you recall the fancies of many years ago,
> When the pulse danced those light measures that again it cannot know?
> Ah! we both of us are altered, and now we talk no more
> Of all the old creations that haunted us of yore.
> Then any favourite volume was a mine of long delight
> From whence we took our future to fashion as we might;
> We lived again its pages, we were its chiefs and kings,
> As actual, but more pleasant, than what the day now brings.
> Within that lovely garden what happy hours went by,
> While we fancied that around us spread foreign sea and sky.
> Ah! the dreaming and the distance no longer haunt the mind;
> We leave, in leaving childhood, life's fairyland behind.

The first trouble in her life was her father's business failure, followed by the loss of their pleasant homes and the establishment of the family in a small house in Brompton; but his love and sympathy were still hers; he was proud of his clever daughter, and, though writing was then hardly considered to be a respectable occupation for a woman, he encouraged her in her efforts and was gratified by her success. With his death another change came over her fortunes; the little money that remained was barely enough to keep her mother and sister, and going back to her old school, which was now kept by two sisters of the name of Lance, she made her home there. Her work was now unremitting, for she plied her pen not only to supply her own needs, but for the help of her mother and sister and of the brother who was studying at Oxford preparatory to taking Holy Orders.

Her first volume of poems, *The Improvisatrice,* was published in 1824, and the initials, L. E. L., became even more widely known. A mystery always excites interest, and the question of the author's identity was discussed on all sides; but some verses written by one of the readers of the *Literary Gazette* show that the desire to lift the veil was not universal:

> I know not who or what thou art,
> Nor do I seek to know thee,
> Whilst thou, performing thus thy part,
> Such banquets can bestow me.
> Then be, as long as thou shalt list,
> My viewless, nameless melodist.

That the secret became known to many is proved by the fact that Miss Lance told her friends that the only trouble her new inmate gave in the house was "the constant opening the door to coroneted carriages." Yet, in spite of this notoriety, the young poetess was so careful in her mode of life that it might have seemed impossible

for Ignorance and Suspicion to find any material for their whispers; her holidays were generally spent with her uncle, Dr. Whittington Landon, the Dean of Exeter, and she never attended any festivity unchaperoned.

Yet rumours soon began to make themselves heard and when they came to her ears she wrote to Mrs. S. C. Hall, the wife of the well-known editor and critic, who was one of her warmest friends:

> I have lived nearly all my life with the same people. The Misses Lance are strict, scrupulous, and particular, moreover, from having kept a school so long, with habits of minute observation. The affection they feel for me can hardly be undeserved; I would desire nothing more than to defer to their opinion.

That the admiration she received was the cause of envy, and that envy led on to detraction, is undeniable. Attraction is generally considered to be one of the best gifts the gods can bestow, but it brings its dangers with it. Her portrait shows a face of great charm and contemporary accounts speak of her lovely complexion, her lustrous eyes and dark silky lashes, her graceful figure and elegant carriage; William Jerdan, the editor of the *Literary Gazette*, says that he thought her "a creature of another sphere, though with every fascination that could make her loveable in this everyday world." Mrs. Hall gives the same testimony, though with even greater emphasis:

> It always seemed to me impossible not to love her, not to cherish her. Perhaps the greatest magic she exercised was that after the first rush of remembrance of that wonderful young woman's writings had subsided, she rendered you completely oblivious of what she had done by the irresistible charm of what she was. You forgot all about her books, you felt only the intense delight of life with her.

But an even greater tribute was that of the Ettrick Shepherd, who on first seeing her stared amazedly, and then exclaimed in mingled astonishment and remorse:

> I did na think ye'd ha been sae bonny! I hae written mony a bitter thing against ye, but I'll do sae nae mair. I did na think ye'd ha been sae bonny!

That romantically minded undergraduates were not the only admirers of her poems is shown by a quotation from one of Blackwood's *Noctes Ambrosianæ*:

> *Tickler*: I love L. E. L.
>
> *Christopher North*: So do I! And being old gentlemen we may blamelessly make the public our confidante. There is a passionate purity in all her feelings that endears to me both her human and her poetical character; she is a true enthusiast. Her affections overflow the imagery her fancy lavishes on all the subjects of her song, and colour it all with a rich and tender light which makes even confusion beautiful, gives a glowing charm even to indistinct conception, and when the thoughts themselves are full-formed and substantial, which they often are, brings them promiscuously out upon the soul in flashes that startle us into sudden admiration.

It was her poems, not her somewhat invertebrate novels, that roused this widespread feeling, and to read them to-day is to be reminded of Longfellow's lines, "Daylight and Moonlight"; in the night the Moon seemed "a spirit glorified," and the poet's song in its right atmosphere a thing "of grace and mystery"; but when the glamour goes the glory and the grace go with it:

In broad daylight and at noon
Yesterday I saw the moon,
Sailing high, but faint and white,
Like a schoolboy's paper kite.

In broad daylight, yesterday
I heard a poet's mystic lay,
And it seemed to me at most
As a phantom or a ghost.

If we could recapture the atmosphere in which L. E. L.'s verses were written we might understand the spell that she cast upon her readers; but post-war England is far indeed removed from the England of a hundred years ago. They fell from her pen in multitudes:

As thick as leaves in Vallombrosa,

and not one is better or worse than its companions.

The sun was setting o'er the sea,
A beautiful, a summer sun,
Crimson and bright, as if not night,
But rather day had just begun.
That lighted sky, that lighted sea,
They spoke of Love and Hope to me.

I thought how Love, I thought how Hope,
O'er the horizon of my heart
Had poured their rays like yonder sun,
Like yon sun only to depart.
Alas! that ever suns should set,
Or Hope grow cold, or Love forget!

Or again, in more romantic mood:

I did not wish to see his face,
I knew it could not be,
Tho' not a look had altered there
What once it was to me.
Since last we met a fairy spell
Had been from each removed,
How strange it is that those can change
Who were so much beloved!
It is a bitter thing to know
The heart's enchantment o'er,
But 'tis more bitter still to feel
It can be charmed no more.

Verses like these are a negligible quantity in the present day, but they were entirely appropriate to an age that delighted in Annuals, and in Books of Beauty adorned with steel engravings of elegant

females with drooping curls and simpering smiles. That their author had any sense of humour it would be hard to believe had not some of her letters been preserved; in them, no longer the fashionable author, she shows a pretty wit. In one, describing a visit to some friends in the country, she says that when the news went round that she was a writer from London it had a petrifying effect:

> The consequence was that, seated by the only young man I had beheld, I acted upon him like an air-pump, suspending his very breath and motion, and my asking him for a mince-pie—a dish of which I had for some time been surveying with longing eyes—acted like an electric shock, and his start not a little discomposed a no-age-at-all, silk-vested spinster, whose plate was thereby deposited in her lap; and last, not least, in the hurry, he forgot to help me!

Again, while staying with some cousins, she writes:

> When I first arrived, Julia and Isabel began to cross-question me: "Can you play?" "No." "Can you draw?" "No." At last they came down to—"Can you read and write?" Here I was able to answer to their great relief—"Yes, a little." I believe Julia, in the first warmth of cousinly affection, was going to offer to teach me the alphabet.

That she was not too much of a bluestocking to scorn feminine pleasures is shown by a letter in which she describes a fashionable wedding:

> I have lived in an atmosphere of silk, where the earth was satin and the sky was blonde. Skirts, with full plaits all round, are no longer in my mind associated with a Dutchwoman: I despise any dress whose circumference is not like Grosvenor Square. Nothing has saved me from having an envious fever, but that one pretty thing has put another out of my head. In the multitude of dresses, as of counsellors, there has been safety—for who ever heard of dying for a dozen.

These letters, and others like them, show that her life, though not without its troubles, had much innocent happiness in it, and it may well seem incredible that one whose conduct was so circumspect and whose writings were innocuous to the point of insipidity can have fallen a victim to Calumny. But the time had come for the Serpent to enter her Eden, and he came in the person of Dr. William Maginn. Maginn might have been no more than a vague memory to-day if Thackeray had not given him immortality in the character of Captain Shandon and if Lockhart's epitaph had not had so haunting an echo; it concludes:

> At last he was beat and sought help of the bin—
> All the same to the Doctor from claret to gin—
> Which led swiftly to jail and consumption therein.
> It was much when the bones rattled loose in the skin
> He got leave to die here out of Babylon's din.
> Barring drink and the girls I ne'er heard a sin:
> Many worse, better few, than bright, broken Maginn.

"He was his own worst enemy," was the verdict passed upon him by his friends and acquaintances; but a man who is his own worst enemy is bound to bring disaster upon others, and one of Maginn's victims was L.E.L. Born in 1793, he was thirty when he came to London and besides having taken an LL.D. degree was well-known as a contributor to *Blackwood* and other important publications. Appointed by Mr. Murray to the post of foreign correspondent to his new daily paper, *The Representative,* he went for a time to Paris, but soon returned and was put in charge of its lighter columns. That he was a brilliant writer there is no doubt, but unfortunately his discretion was as small as his talents were great, and he soon involved Mr. Murray in trouble by his offensive references to living people. He would probably have been dismissed, but the paper came to a premature end in July, 1826, and his appointment with it. Mr. Fraser was his next employer, but his hot temper embroiled him in fresh quarrels, he was more than once in prison, and in 1842 his drinking habits brought him to the grave.

It is Innocence whom Botticelli makes the victim of Calumny, and it was in all innocence that L. E. L. asked the help of this reckless Irishman whose talents she had heard so highly praised by her literary acquaintances. It is quite possible that she made use of some unguarded expressions in writing to him, and it is more than possible that he tried to take advantage of them; but the fact remains that she sent for Mr. Grantly Berkeley, who had already thrashed Mr. Fraser and fought a duel with Maginn on account of some scandalous remarks that had appeared in Fraser's magazine. Berkeley, in his *Recollections,* says that she told him with "passionate sobs" that Maginn was threatening to blackmail her and that he promised her to deal with him. He adds:

> Of course it created the bitterest feeling against us both; the miserably assuming tyrant saw that the prey was taken out of his jaws, and I was warned by Lady Blessington that he but bided a time to demonstrate his jealousy and revenge. I laughed at this, but took no notice of the man, left him to do as he pleased, but never for a moment intermitted my watchfulness over my clever and interesting *protegée.*

Berkeley was blamed in after years for having betrayed L. E. L.'s confidence, but there is no doubt that she was sincerely grateful for his championship, though it did not by any means secure her from the consequence of Maginn's attack. That anyone should believe the stories that were circulated about her seemed impossible to her and a letter to Mrs. Hall shows how deeply her friends' suspicions wounded her:

> You are quite right in saying that you owe me an apology for your letter, though I own that I am surprised at its contents; for,

from all that has been said to me, I had no idea that the least importance was attached to the slanders of a violent and malevolent woman. Mrs. Maginn is too well-known in her own circle; she speaks but of me as she speaks of everyone else. She has for some time past taken a great dislike to me and first one spiteful invention and then another was its consequence—always, however, fawning and flattering to my face. As to the fancy about her husband, I cannot even call it jealousy, for jealousy implies some degree of feeling; it is sheer envy, operating upon a weak and vulgar, but cunning nature. As to the idea of an attachment between me and Dr. Maginn it seems to me too absurd even for denial.

And again to another friend:

> What is my life? One day of drudgery after another; difficulties incurred for others which have ever pressed upon me; broken health, which every year by one severe illness after another shows is tasked beyond its strength; envy, hatred, malice and all uncharitableness—these are the fruits of a successful literary career for a woman. I can do nothing. It is impossible to lead a more quiet life, or less to provoke animadversion than I do, and yet is there anything too malicious to be invented, or too absurd to be repeated about me?

To Mrs. Thomson, in the letter quoted at the beginning of this article, she says that examination of her conduct would be her best defence, but that to her friends it ought not to need defence; from them

> I ask brief and indignant denial, based only on their conviction of falsehood. As regards myself, I have no answer beyond contemptuous silence, an appeal to all who know my past life and a very bitter sense of innocence and injury.

But proudly as she met the storm it was bound to have a serious effect upon her, and a severe illness followed which left her with lowered vitality and intensely depressed spirits. It was now that John Forster made her an offer of marriage and though he was some years the younger her life might have had a happy ending if she had accepted him. But though he had love enough to ask her to marry him when others looked down upon her, it was not that supreme love which, we are told, believeth all things and never faileth. The offer was made, but to it was added a request to be told whether there was any truth in the damaging reports that were being so freely circulated. It is hardly to be wondered at that she refused to satisfy him:

> Go to my friends (she said) my respectable, married, trustworthy female friends, whom I see almost daily—ask them.

The respectable female friends soon convinced him that the reports were groundless, but when he returned to tell her that he was ready to marry her, she replied that his doubts could not be forgiven and that she would have no more to do with him. Her attitude can be understood, but unfortunately this rejection of her suitor served as a confirmation of the reports in the minds of many, and her position was so wretched that she told several of her friends that she would

marry anyone if by so doing she could escape from England. It was while she was in this dejected state that George Maclean appeared upon the scene, home on leave from Cape Coast, where he was Governor of the Castle. They met at a party given in his honour, and after the briefest acquaintance they were engaged. He was forty, she was thirty-six, but the years between them might have been fourteen instead of four; he was dried up and angular, she was still charming and attractive; he was of so silent a nature that he was said never to speak if he could avoid it, she, spirited and sparkling, craved for sympathetic companionship. That two such opposites could find happiness seemed impossible; her friends were apprehensive and though she persisted, the engagement was at one time definitely broken. Grantly Berkeley gives his own account of the quarrel:

> Mr. Maclean, by his conduct, made it clearly apparent that the accusations against her fair fame had reached him. He absented himself, became sullen and callous—in short, strove to induce his affianced to cancel their engagement. Miss Landon, however, had made up her mind not to throw away another chance, enticed him back and he, finding no honourable way of evading his obligations, most reluctantly gave instructions for the wedding.

Whether this was the true explanation or not, the breach was eventually healed and on the 7th June, 1838, the wedding took place at St. Mary's, Bryanston Square, her brother performing the ceremony and Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton giving her away. A farewell dinner was given to the bridal pair before they sailed, at which Mr. Hall proposed the bride's health in glowing terms. His object was to make the bridegroom realize what a treasure he had won, but his eulogy met with no response, for on rising to reply Mr. Maclean merely remarked, "If Mrs. Maclean has as many friends as Mr. Hall says she has, I wonder they allow her to leave them," and with that sat down again. Her wish had been to take an English maid with her, but this he forbade, and the stewardess of the ship, a Mrs. Bailey, waited on her during the voyage and agreed to stay with her for a time when they reached their destination. Her first letters home were fairly cheerful; she describes the Castle as a "noble building," and extols the scenery round it, but Dr. Madden, the biographer of Lady Blessington, who visited the Castle after her death, says that her account of it was utterly misleading. That she put no gloss upon her way of life is shown by a letter to a friend in which she says:

> Mr. Maclean expects me to cook, wash and iron—in short to do the work of a servant. He says he will never cease correcting me until he has broken my spirit, and complains of my temper, which you know was never, even under heavy trials, bad.

To escape from censorious tongues had been her desire, but she had not thought to purchase her release by the loss of the affection that

had made life sweet to her: if her husband had loved her the strangeness of her new home would soon have been forgotten, but the letter written to Mrs. Fagan four months after her marriage shows that instead of opening the door to a happier existence it had plunged her into even deeper sorrows:

> I cannot but write you a brief account of how I enact the part of a feminine Robinson Crusoe. The solitude, except for an occasional diner, is absolute; from seven o'clock in the morning till seven, when we dine, I never see Mr. Maclean, and seldom anyone else. We were welcomed by a series of dinners, which I am very glad are over, for it is very awkward to be the only lady. On three sides we are surrounded by the sea. I like the perpetual dash upon the rocks; one wave comes up after another and is for ever dashed to pieces, like human hopes that only swell to be disappointed. We advance, up springs the shining forth of hope or love, a moment white and gone for ever. Dearest, do not forget me! Pray write to me—write about yourself, nothing else interests me half so much.

This letter, written but not posted, was lying on the table when Mrs. Bailey went to her mistress's room; the door would not yield and when at last she managed to push it open she saw her lying upon the floor, an empty bottle in her hand. What followed was enough to raise the gravest suspicions; a doctor was summoned, but though no effort could restore her he did not ask for a *post mortem*, and the conflicting statements made at the inquest were never investigated. Mrs. Bailey declared that Mrs. Maclean was in the habit of taking prussic acid as a remedy for spasms, but the bottle had no smell of it, and the London chemist from whom her travelling medicine chest had been procured said that none had been contained in it. Another statement, that a cup of coffee had been taken to her room during the morning, was not mentioned at the inquest, and the rumour that poison had been put into it by a jealous woman remained a rumour.

One suspicious feature in the case was the extraordinary haste with which the funeral was conducted. A grave was dug, not in consecrated ground, but in the courtyard of the Castle, and there her body was laid within six hours of her death. It is not to be wondered at that all sorts of surmises arose when the news reached the ears of her friends in England. That an investigation should be set on foot was their immediate request, but when Lord John Russell, Secretary of State for the Colonies, was applied to, his answer was that there were too many difficulties in the way for it to be possible. Great as was their grief there was nothing more that they could do.

> Oh! that poor L. E. L. (writes Mrs. Opie to Miss Mitford). Didst thou know her? When will the mystery attending her be cleared up? Emma Roberts (a friend living in Miss Lance's house) writes to me that she did not destroy herself, but something or someone must have done it. She thinks she ruptured something in the brain, but how violent must the emotion have been that caused it.

Lady Blessington, while not giving an opinion as to the manner of the death, says that the persecution she had suffered had had a deadly effect upon her:

> There was no slander too vile and no assertion too wicked to heap on the fame of this injured creature. Those who disbelieved the calumny refrained not from repeating it until it became a general topic of conversation. Her own sex, fearful of censure, had not courage to defend her, and this highly gifted and sensitive creature, without having committed a single error, found herself a victim to slander. Not a single proof could be had even of the semblance of guilt, though a thousand were furnished by perfect innocence.

Mr. Maclean, meanwhile, kept silence, except for a letter to his mother-in-law offering her an annuity of £100 a year. Mrs. Landon replied that she could only accept it on his assurance that her daughter had been happy with him; to this letter he returned no answer, nor did he hold any further communication with her. It was in the year 1841 that Dr. Madden paid his visit to Cape Coast Castle; Mr. Maclean told him that he had been greatly vilified and asked him to take up the cudgels in his defence; but this Madden could not do for he found it impossible to obtain any definite information about what had taken place.

Maclean died in 1847 and two English officers who visited the Castle shortly afterwards tried to get at the facts, but all the fresh evidence that they could discover was that he had ordered his secretary to destroy a box of papers that he had always kept under his bed. In the flagged courtyard of the Castle, with soldiers marching over her head, they found the grave of L. E. L. with a Latin epitaph composed by her husband, which they translated as follows:

Here lies interred
All that was mortal of Letitia Elizabeth Maclean,
Adorned with a pure mind,
Singularly favoured of the Muse,
And dearly beloved by all,
She was prematurely snatched away
By Death, in the flower of her age,
On the 13th October, 1838,
aged 36 years.
The marble which you behold, oh! traveller,
A sorrowing husband has erected,
Vain emblem of his grief.

That her husband's sorrow was genuine was fiercely denied by her friends; their fixed belief was that his unkindness had been the final drop in her cup of woe, and the poem that she wrote in her exile —included in the volume published after her death—seems to confirm it:

Saint Mary's shrine is now laid lowly,
Shivered its wondrous rainbow panes,
Silent its hymns—that pale flower solely
Of all its former pride remains.

Hushed is the ancient anthem, keeping
The vigil of the silent night,
Gone is the censer's silver sweeping,
Dim is the sacred taper's light.

Still is the quiet cloister wanted
For those who look with weary eye
On life, have long been disenchanted,
Who have one only wish—to die.

How oft the heart of woman, yearning
For love it dreams but never meets,
From the world, worn and weary, turning,
Could shelter in these dim retreats.

Then were that solemn quiet given,
That life's harsh, feverish dreams deny;
Then might the last pray'r rise to heaven—
My God, I prithee let me die!

Innocence is the victim of Calumny! If Botticelli were to paint his picture over again the central figure might well wear the features of that L. E. L. who, once the idol of innumerable admirers, died alone and heart-broken. Only a few years before, the death of Keats had evoked Shelley's *Adonais*; there can be no comparison between the genius of Keats and the facile grace of L. E. L., but it was not slander that struck him to his death, and one of the stanzas of the immortal Ode is even more appropriate to the verse-maker than it was to the poet and might well have been adapted as a tribute to her memory:

She has outsoared the shadow of our night;
Envy and calumny and hate and pain,
And that unrest which men miscall delight,
Can touch her not and torture not again;
From the contagion of the world's slow stain
She is secure, and now can never mourn
A heart grown cold, a head grown grey in vain;
Nor, when the spirit's self has ceased to burn
With sparkless ashes load an unlamented urn.

MARY BRADFORD WHITING.

DEVELOPMENTS AND EXPERIMENTS.

This Section of our Journal aims at chronicling not only developments in theological thought and in ecclesiastical organization, but also practical experiments in all branches of religious life and service.

Often when successful attempts have been made to solve some problem in one part of the country, the rest of the Churches remain ignorant, and we trust that these pages will not only serve as a clearing-house of ideas and a record of changing emphasis, but also broadcast valuable information of progress in Church and denominational life.

Our representatives in the Colonies and the United States will from time to time contribute accounts of similar movements. The Editor will be glad to consider brief articles serving this purpose.

PROGRESSIVE EVANGELISM.

More than half-a-century ago I learned in the slums of Glasgow that the world needs not a teacher, an example and a leader only, but a divine Lord who can "save to the uttermost all who come unto God through Him"; and that conviction has not only persisted through all my progress in theology since, but has been in its course a guide and a guard. It has been, and still is, to me a vital concern that the Gospel of the grace of God in Christ and His Cross should hold the central place in the theology and the preaching of ministers; and it causes acute distress when any indications come to me that "the hungry sheep look up and are not fed." All such indications are to be tested carefully before being trusted.

(1) When the complaint is made that the students in the colleges are not taught the Gospel I think of the teachers whom I know, not only in the Congregational Colleges, but in others also, and of the theology which is found in their writings, and I am convinced that, whether the charge against their preaching is true or not, that at least is not the explanation. (That in many cases the charge is unjustified is a conclusion which my own experience establishes). Three ardent young men at the beginning of my ministry in Montrose asked for an interview; when I asked how I could help them, I was startled by their reply, that they had come to ask me to preach the Gospel. Coming to close quarters I found that they missed some familiar phrases which they identified with the Gospel, and failed to grasp the truth expressed in language which to me was more accurate and adequate. I am sure that there are many cases where the new presentation of the truth, to which fresh knowledge leads, is suspected by the undiscerning as a departure from the truth. A sincere and earnest young Methodist minister told me that when he tried to preach Christ Crucified as Saviour he was charged with not being orthodox, be-

cause he could not teach penal substitution and did not use the phrase "the precious blood of the Lamb" often enough. Let it be said frankly and firmly there are old presentations of the Gospel which a well-trained young minister cannot honestly make his own, even to avoid offence, or to give pleasure to his more conservative hearers. *Unnecessary* change of language shows a lack of consideration, and sometimes is an evidence of conceit, but candour may often compel a man to abandon shibboleths. It must be conceded that older presentations of the Gospel find a readier response in many hearers than newer, not because they are truer and better, but because the terms, being more familiar, appear more intelligible and satisfying. The pragmatic test of immediate success would probably give the preference to these older presentations, as time must be allowed for the newer to make their due impression. Where preacher and hearer meet on this common ground I should not question the value of such preaching; and even thank God that what to me is an inadequate and defective theology is being used and blessed of God for the saving of souls. I am much more concerned that men should come into real contact with the grace of God than about the correctness of the theology by which it is mediated. Not only tolerance but even appreciation and gratitude for the good work being thus done is the attitude those who have advanced beyond this conservative evangelicalism are justified in assuming.

(2) Truth, however, has a sacred claim, and progress towards the truth is an imperative obligation; and not only so, this older presentation has often betrayed very serious practical defects. As Paul recognizes in *Rom.* 6 the doctrine of an objective atonement—*sola gratia sola fide*—justification by faith alone—has led not always to the antinomianism the apostle dreaded, nor often even to moral laxity, but to a lower and narrower standard of moral duty than the principle of equal love to self and neighbour enjoins. The self has been more loved for its own safety than the neighbour for the service due to him. Even when there has been moral concern, the standard has been more often confined to individual character than to social obligations. I bring no general charge against the older evangelism; the philanthropy of the earlier part of last century owed a great deal to the Evangelical Revival; and many rigid evangelists have been conspicuous for their recognition of the duties of citizenship. Yet that there is this danger cannot be denied. A more adequately ethical presentation of salvation as not for safety but for sanctity, service, and sacrifice is imperatively necessary.

(3) Further, if some are gained by this older presentation many are lost. Informed and intelligent persons who have been influenced in their thinking by the knowledge of to-day are repelled by preach-

ing which to them appears dishonest, since they assume that the preacher is not ignorant of, but is ignoring, this knowledge. We want the common people to hear the Gospel gladly; but we do not want to estrange the educated classes; the soul of a scholar or thinker is as worth saving as that of the illiterate. And the Christian Church has lost influence and authority because of its theological and ethical conservatism, and its opposition to the assured results of modern research.

(4) There is, however, a new presentation of the Gospel in undue deference to criticism, science, and philosophy in matters where none of these can speak the last word, which lacks what is essential to its effectiveness. The Christian life is sometimes reduced to a moral code, or a social ideal, and the personal relation of communion with, and delight in, God is ignored. It is represented as a life of love for men, and not also as a life in love with God. An unethical spirituality is defective, but no less is an unspiritual ethics. God and goodness are inseparable, for He is the source, the standard and the support of the good life. Hence also Christ is not only a pioneer believer; He is as Saviour and Lord the object of faith. Sin is not merely a defect of nature, but a disobedience of God, and forgiveness is not only an amendment of life, but a recovery of fellowship with God. Man does not by his searching find out God, but God first so seeks man that He can be found. Man's freedom is in his dependence on God, and his achievement, whatever it be, is God's enabling.

(5) Criticism may require us in candour to give up the verbal inspiration of Scripture, and consequent scientific and historical inerrancy, and even moral and religious infallibility in all its parts. But in the Bible there remains the divine Word through men of the Spirit of God making men "wise unto salvation, thoroughly furnished for every good work." The sciences may require us to abandon any claim for the authority of the Scriptures as a textbook of supernatural knowledge in those spheres where man's natural capacity of knowing is sufficient for assurance of truth, and may even demand that we be on our guard against a credulity about the supernatural, without adequately tested evidence; but the methods of science limit its sphere of authority as a guide to truth; and there are realities of the divine, disclosed in the moral conscience and the religious consciousness, the certainty of which need not dread the *Nay* of science, or wait upon its *Yea*, for "the secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him," and spiritual things can be only spiritually discerned. The agnosticism of last century was an acknowledgment that there is reality beyond the reach of science. There are some Christian preachers who allow to science a final judgment on many questions which the man of

science who knows the kind of knowledge he can reach would not claim. To give one instance, man's moral conscience and religious consciousness so testify to his personal liberty and responsibility that it is not necessary to snatch a support, which may prove a broken reed, in the principle of indeterminacy. The seer and the saint need not go cap-in-hand to the physicist or the psychologist even for leave to know God and seek after holiness. The scientific habit may be of value as a protection against superstition, and as a stimulus to prove all things so that only the tested truth may be accepted. But as regards the content of the Gospel as expressed in *John* 3^{16} or *1 Cor.* 13 —the eternal reality of the love of God through the historical revelation in the grace of Christ and in the common possession of the Holy Spirit unto eternal life—science cannot utter any *veto,* nor offer any *imprimatur.* Human faith in divine grace has its own inner witness in the Holy Spirit. It is foolish and wrong to try and make the Gospel more acceptable by accommodating its content to the fleeting mental fashions of the hour. Even less ground is there for allowing any philosophy, realist or idealist, to be the measure of the truth of God. From philosophy I have learned to try and think things together, to be as coherent in my theology as the complexity of the divine revelation and the human redemption in Christ allows; but neither Plato nor Hegel has the words of eternal life as has Christ.

(6) The alternative for a progressive evangelism is not reaction or revolution, fundamentalism or modernism. If we cannot preach the God of the older theology, based largely on the Old Testament, Jesus has given us a conception of God as holy love, judging and, if need be, punishing sin, as well as forgiving the penitent and believing. The reality of man's sinfulness does not depend on any doubtful doctrine of its origin in the Fall, but is attested in universal history and individual experience. If one cannot hold to the formula of "two natures in one person", it is an ultimate certainty for faith that God is in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. Even if a man abandon theories of the atonement, in the Cross the love of God reaches, possesses, and transforms him, so that he hates the sin in the very moment in which the love of God forgives it. If one cannot frighten men with the threat of hell-fire, one can warn them that as a man soweth, so also he shall reap, and that only in Christ who can save to the uttermost, is there the certainty of eternal life. The world's need of Christ is so great, and the sufficiency of Christ for the world so sure, that the varying, but always inadequate, human interpretations of the infinite divine reality should not be allowed to separate those who believe in evangelism from, or oppose them to, one another, since the aim is one: "Christ for the world we sing; the world to Christ we bring."

A. E. Garvie.

PRESCRIPTION AND DIAGNOSIS.

The post-War revolt against authority has failed. On every hand there is evidence that the present generation is disillusioned in its disillusionment. The speed and intensity, the variety and irresponsibility of modern life, are producing their own reaction. At present the evidence for this belief is in isolated cases rather than in universal recognition. Yet a few straws show which way the wind blows.

Non-religious people are looking wistfully for some anchorage, some assurance that life has meaning and purpose. The conventional minister—and how conventional we all are—hails these signs with delight. Eagerly he searches the pages of religious history and notes the ebb and flow of religious fervour. Yes, he breathes, the Church shall come into her own again.

Not all modern thinkers, however, are so sanguine. Mr. Walter Lippmann argues with great skill and knowledge that the analogy from past history is not valid. In *A Preface to Morals* he works out the thesis that modern conditions are radically different. So different in fact that the Church is no longer able to cope with the situation. She has outlived her usefulness. No one can read this book intelligently without being profoundly disturbed by the weight of evidence given. If only the Church had as profound analysts of the situation. Yet, for all our admiration of Mr. Lippmann's ability as analyst, his synthesis leaves a doubt. Modern man must achieve "detachment" and "disinterestedness". It is a noble ideal, but it is simply an awkward way of saying "Seek first the Kingdom of God", and Christian love, with God and Christ omitted.

Give me a lever and a place to stand, and I will lift the world. Quite. But you cannot lift the world if the lever be refused and the place to stand ignored. Man is still left tugging at his own boot straps. The humanists of the twentieth century have designed a noble locomotive, but they have failed to provide the motive power.

Let it not be hastily assumed, however, that the inadequacy of humanism proves the adequacy of the old technique of the Church. Why is it that so many writers of to-day come within reach of the ideals of the Church and yet remain outside? Some are near to the spirit of Christ, but dare not acknowledge it, because they fear to be identified with the conventional interpretation of Christ. Other writers seem to have the spirit completely but do not recognize it as such. They assay to criticize Christ, but they are only criticizing the Church's picture of Christ.

There are still others writers who criticize more pertinently, but Christians seem unaware of it. Mr. David Grayson takes his reader along fragrant country lanes of great beauty. It is easy to be carried along happily dreaming, to miss what is no less than a terrific smack

in the face. In *Adventures in Solitude* Mr. Grayson describes the emotions of a man who has hitherto enjoyed full health, as he awaits an operation. At last it is over, and the convalescent can reflect with detachment upon the hospital as a modern institution. Here is mankind at its best. Here the millionaire and pauper are equal. The leaders of the nation and the humble artisan receive equal treatment. It is the equality not of mediocrity, but of the very best science and the skill of man can give. The hospital's doors are closed to none. It stands to bring relief and health to rich and poor, coloured and white, good and bad, without discrimination. The Church should be no less inclusive. Is it? Universally so?

This, however, is not the most searching reflection of the convalescent. Here is what must challenge every thinking man. "The hospital diagnoses before it prescribes. The Church prescribes before it diagnoses."

Is it not true?

Nonsense, we protest. The two cases are not parallel. Hospitals deal with many different types of illness. Medical and surgical cases require different treatment. There are constitutional weaknesses, hereditary illnesses. The Church deals with one illness only, Sin. All men are sinners. Christ is the Saviour of all men.

But supposing you entered a hospital and the doctor, without looking at you, said, "This man is ill because he is unwell. We'll operate to-morrow", would that give you confidence?

Has not sin its various forms, requiring differing treatments? What of the sin so largely due to environment? What of the souls distorted through hereditary taints? And yet we present Christ as a patent medicine to cure all. I believe in the words of an old disused hymn that "He will cure all our soul's diseases", but each disease requires diagnosis. The depths of Christ are unsearchable in extent, but does deep call unto deep when we seek to win men from sin? For all our acquaintance with modern psychology and science have we learned this fundamental point in technique, *Prescription must follow diagnosis*?

Of course we have analysed the restless, directionless impatience of the modern age as an inversion of man's search after God. We quote St. Augustine, "Thou hast made us for Thyself, and our souls are not at rest until they find themselves in Thee". But how do we convince the multitudes of this, how do we set about to win their confidence?

The multitudes, ah, yes, the multitudes. How typical. We think of full churches, long membership rolls, but how rarely do we think of individuals? We talk of individuality, but how often do we get to grips with individual souls? How often are we guided by the Holy Spirit to diagnose the particular trouble of a

particular man or woman? Yet every Sunday we prescribe with absolute confidence.

How is it that the Church has fallen into this pit of self-complacency? I do not know unless it be that we have forgotten to think in terms of individuals. We are obsessed with the desire to fill pews. We make our "advanced" pronouncements upon world politics, economic confusion, and the latest scientific theories—and these are well enough in their place. But do we not, we ministers of Christ's Gospel, think more of the congregation's estimate of our intellectual ability than of the hungry soul of the butcher and baker and candlestick maker? God grant that this is but the awakening from a complacent dream of but one minister, but is it?

In our preaching we assume that we are guided by the Holy Spirit. People thank us for sermons, so we feel we must be on the right track. But since the Holy Spirit guides the congregation to listen, it is a possibility that they are helped in spite of rather than because of our preaching. It is not enough to have a sentimental belief that God speaks through us. It is essential to remember that we are preaching to particular people and their particular needs.

Are we then to make all our sermons applicable to one individual whose needs we know? If we did our sermons would at least be aiming at an object. But why consider sermons as the only or even the main channel of approaching human souls? The alternatives? Visiting, study groups, vestry hours, Question Sundays? Yes, they are all good in their way, but all are open to serious objection if considered as the one sure way of approaching individuals. There is no system which will suit all circumstances. What then can we do? The question is typical of the age. We are always wanting to do things to justify ourselves before men. We are impatient of delay, and yet we do not seem to move very far.

The question we must ask and answer is, What can we be? It is what we are in our innermost souls which will be the great test of our ministries. We must be patient, receptive, waiting upon God to tell us how to diagnose. Correct prescription will follow not only more easily but more accurately.

There is nothing original in all this. In fact it is commonplace. So commonplace that it has lost its significance. And that is why we ministers of Christ have lost our significance to the multitudes. We think in terms of multitudes. But the multitudes think in terms of individuals. Only when we recapture the passionate intelligent love of Christ for divine personality in human personalities shall we recapture the power and influence which the Church ought to have.

We have lost our faith in the leaven, in the candle, in the apparently small things, and so we have failed.

E. Clifford Knowles.

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION AND THE CHURCH.

A STUDY IN PEW-RENT MORALITY

As a child, I grew up in a Congregational Church, and was a Patrol Leader in the Church Guide Company. There came a day when the District Church Parade was held at the Parish Church, a fine old building on the banks of the Thames. To reach it, we marched along a deserted and untidy High Street—deserted, because it was ten o'clock on Sunday morning and the inhabitants were still in bed; untidy, because it was littered with paper, cabbage leaves, and orange peel left from Saturday night's costers' barrows.

We swung into the Church, a trim, erect company. The first sight that caught my eye was the word FREE in large black letters on the back pews. It gave a sudden chill to my youthful enthusiasm. My own church had abolished pew-rents, and I had thought that in the "House of God" all seats would have been of necessity free.

A second shock awaited me. My eyes strayed to the gallery. There on the panels in front of it were lists of benefactors who had left money to the church within the last fifty or a hundred years, and the form in which the money was left was set out in detail. Thus Mr. A. left his in Consols, Mr. B. in inscribed stock. I wondered which kind God really preferred.

The whole scene flashed back into my mind while reading *The Age of the Chartists,* by J. L. and Barbara Hammond. As I read their two chapters on The Church, I thought of that word "Free" and of the Consols. In the system of pew-rents, I felt, and in the attitude of mind represented by the lettering of that gallery, lay keys to understanding the morality of the Industrial Revolution. And such understanding is of vital necessity for us to-day, who live under its effects far more than we realize.

In the nineteenth century the Industrial Revolution was looked upon as the glory of England, but it is rapidly becoming the bugbear of the twentieth. To-day in countless articles and addresses we read and hear of the evils that followed in its wake in the economic sphere. In a brilliant book, *The Discovery of Europe,* Mr. Cohen-Portheim traces how the Great War grew inevitably out of the economic doctrines and attitudes of mind of the Industrial Revolutionary era. We are accustomed to estimating its effect on the economic life of our country; but we are apt to forget that it had a profound effect upon our spiritual life also, and that the Churches to-day have by no means yet freed themselves from its influence.

That we tend to overlook this period in Church life can be seen from some of the recent discussions on Church attendance. In the

heat of the controversy over Sunday cinemas, some speak as if the decline in Church attendance were a new problem, peculiar to our own generation. Others look with envy to a somewhat misty golden age when the village used to worship on Sunday morning, and joined in games on the village green on Sunday afternoon; while yet others look back with respect to the strict Sunday of the Puritans, observed with soberness and rigour. Few people stop to consider the effect of the Industrial Revolution on English Church life and the English Sunday. Yet some of the seeds of alienation from the Church were surely sown then.

It was not so much the actual changes brought about in the social structure as the philosophy of life underlying those changes which so profoundly affected the spiritual life of our country. It was a philosophy which looked upon the world as a ladder up which a man had to climb if he would reach the prizes which were only to be had at the top. If he could have stopped on any of the higher rungs and looked around, he might have seen far distant views, or the glorious stretch of a countryside, but that would have distracted him from his chief duty in life, which was to reach the top. Not till he arrived there might he pause in mere enjoyment or wonder. When he got there, the prize would be his and his alone, for his own private enjoyment—not to be shared by others who were still only climbing.

But for the great number who never got beyond the first or second rungs of the ladder, and for the yet greater number who never got on to it at all, there remained nothing: no view, they were too near the earth for that; no chance of getting a footing on the ladder, it was too full already; nothing but to trample on each other in the bare struggle for existence. And in a very few years' time this struggling, heaving, pitiful crowd, near the ladder but never on it, had become a race apart. England, as Disraeli pointed out in the sub-title of *Sybil*, now housed "The Two Nations," rich and poor. Under the tragedy of that cleavage we are still living.

But to the leaders of industry, commerce, and religion at the time, this ladder appeared as a golden ladder, leading to the New Jerusalem. Never had the way been so clear for men of diligence and steady application to rise to the top, or in other words to become employers and property owners instead of employed. Many of these leaders, Mr. and Mrs. Hammond point out, were capable and energetic Nonconformists, prevented by their consciences from entering on the public careers which were still closed to Dissenters.

The pioneers of the great metal industries were many of them men who had suffered themselves, or seen their fathers suffer, under Acts of Uniformity and other intolerant laws. In the old incorporated towns all civic power was in the hands of members of the Church of England, for no one could enter office who had not taken the Sacra-

ment in an Established Church once during the previous twelve months. These men had grown up in a hard school; they had inherited the Puritan doctrine which had gradually come to associate application and success in business with moral worth.

> The rich man who was yesterday a beggar was now a noble figure, for in this age the acquisition of wealth was the sign of a virtue which had resisted the temptations of pleasure, and pursued the serious business of life with un-interrupted devotion[1].

A course of reading in the pages of Smiles's *Self-Help* tends to confirm this doctrine, and Dick Whittington is still a national hero!

Many centuries earlier St. Benedict had said "Laziness is the enemy of the soul." Wesley, in the eighteenth century, said that an idle man was driven out of the Methodist societies. Industry became a cardinal virtue, and Methodists made industrious and successful workmen, tradesmen, managers and employers. Thus poverty began to look like crime, and wealth like virtue. Wesley set his face against this, but his followers did not.

It was in such an atmosphere that the system of pew-rents developed and flourished. A question and answer given in the evidence before the Lords Committee on Church Rates[2] throws light on the prevailing attitude. Something had been said about pew-rents as keeping the poor from chapel. "Has it ever come under your observation," the witness was asked, "that when a man becomes a religious and moral man he has a competence to pay pew rent?" "Religion," the witness replied, "always tends to give a man the power to pay for his religion, and the will."

It is to the credit of John Wesley that he fought hard against the system. In his London headquarters, The Foundery,

> all benches were alike. No difference was made here between the rich and the poor; no one was allowed to call any seat his own, first comers sat down first[3].

Parliament, seeing how few were the churches to meet the needs of the populations who made up the new industrial cities, began, in 1818, to pass Acts encouraging Church building.

> In the earliest of these Acts it was stipulated that a fifth of the seats in the churches built with the help of public money should be free, and marked with the word "Free;" in the second, that in all churches rebuilt with the help of public money, half of the additional accommodation should be free[2].

Bishop Blomfield, giving evidence in 1832 before the Committee on the Observance of the Sabbath, said:

> It is the object of the Commissioners for building new Churches as far as they can, to intermingle the seats of the rich and poor, so as to afford the latter nearly the same facilities for hearing which

1 Hammond, *The Age of the Chartists.*
2 *Ibid.*, 259.
3 Telford, *Two West End Chapels.*

> the former enjoy. We have found considerable difficulty in realizing our own wishes in that respect on account of the objections which were made by the richer classes to too great an inter-mixture of the poor among them, objections which it was absolutely necessary to attend to because the whole income of the Minister depends on the pew rents accruing exclusively from the richer classes[1].

At the present time, when we are all so ready to see the shortcomings of the Church, we can take courage from the fact that these words at least ring false to-day.

The workman was more at home in the Wesleyan chapel, where at least he might listen to a fellow-workman in the pulpit, but even there religion tended after a time to become respectable. The man who left his Consols to the Parish Church may have begun life as a pauper. If so, all the more credit to him, said the nineteenth-century Church. Religion and respectability tended to coincide; Christianity and the capitalist system seemed to go together.

Though the rich were anxious not to sit too near the poor, yet the poor, they held, should go to church. In a book entitled *Modern Accomplishments, or the March of Intellect* (by Miss Catherine Sinclair, daughter of the late Sir John Sinclair, Bart. and dedicated by permission to Her Royal Highness the Princess Victoria—3rd edition, 1837) one of the characters says:

> To a devout Christian in the higher circles every day is in some degree a Sabbath; he has leisure at all times to indulge his domestic affections, to read, to reflect, and to pray. But to a poor man, who can truly estimate the enjoyments of a Sabbath, there is, amongst a thousand other advantages the pleasure of a contrast; and in no respect do you see how truly the Great Creator knew what was good for those he had made, than in viewing the peace and happiness, and even the refinement of intellect, which are introduced into the poorest hovel by a due observance of the Sabbath.

Unfortunately some of the "poorest hovels" in the industrial towns were such that it was impossible to find peace and happiness in them, nor were cellar dwellings conducive to the refinement of intellect or the due observance of the Sabbath, which implied attendance at a place of worship.

The masses, working long hours in dreary factories, had but one day in which they were free to realize themselves as human beings. Many of them truly found their freedom in Methodist chapels. Hymn singing was their only contact with the arts, the sermon their only touch with "culture." Listening to the solid joys of the next world brought comfort and encouragement to endure the hardships of this one; hearing the tortures of the damned provided a thrill of horror which also served to stir the emotions and release some of the pent up feelings which had no escape during the week.

But even more of these toilers left the Church severely alone.

[1] Hammond, *The Age of the Chartists.*

Many were too dulled and deadened by their new life to have any desire for worship. Some spent their Sundays in the street or at the beershop. Those who wanted light and colour and gaiety went to the beershop, for though the park gates were closed, the beershop doors stood open. The Temperance Movement, then in its infancy, found supporters among many Free Church leaders, but the fierce denunciation of teetotallers by some nineteenth-century divines sounds strange to modern ears.

Others had a craving for the countryside they had left behind. As a modern critic has said:

> (Englishmen) retain an obstinate love for the countryside they no longer inhabit, escape there whenever possible, and try pathetically to give their town surroundings a country air[1].

This was a craving with which the Church as a whole (though with notable exceptions) felt no sympathy. Park gates were firmly locked on Sundays, Commons were enclosed, allotments bought up for jerry building: to all this dehumanizing process the Church was for many years a silent spectator.

The Church set her face against the theatre on week-days, not only because stage plays sapped the foundations of religion, but also because they would distract the minds of the working classes from industry, which was their appointed function in life. In 1764 Wesley said that a theatre would be

> peculiarly hurtful to a trading city, giving a wrong turn to youth especially, gay, trifling, and directly opposite to the spirit of industry and close application to business.

It was not likely then that she should seek to meet the utterly unsatisfied craving for beauty and colour on the part of the new factory "hands" by pageantry or play, as the medieval church had done.

It is little wonder that many of these toilers were alienated from organized religion, and drifted away. The "paganism" of many folk to-day may have had its origin in these dark years.

It may be argued that this is a one-sided picture of the times. This was also the era of the Evangelical Revival, of the birth of Foreign Missions, of the work of reform led by great Christians like Shaftesbury and Wilberforce. But both sides existed at the same time. We too often stress one at the expense of the other, and this article will not have failed of its purpose if it does something to redress the balance.

This, then, is the legacy which the Industrial Revolution has left to the Church; that industry is the main thing in life, that man ought to want to move up the ladder of success, and that beauty, gaiety, colour, humour, leisure are subsidiary matters, and not of vital concern to the Kingdom of God. We no longer hold these tenets con-

1 Cohen-Portheim, *The Discovery of Europe.*

sciously, but they influence our thinking unconsciously in countless small ways. We say that a member of the congregation has "bettered himself," by which we mean that he has got a job with a larger salary, or more chance of promotion, not necessarily a more creative or worth-while job. We measure the moral worth of a minister by the size of the salary he "commands." We look askance at anyone who suggests that it might be a good thing if we all worked half-time so that some of the unemployed might work half-time too. We are still afraid of leisure.

But the Church has set herself to recapture the vast tracts of life that slipped out of the Kingdom a hundred years ago. Beauty is slowly creeping back into our churches—music and colour are seen to belong to God. The Church is realizing and proclaiming that the Kingdom includes the whole of life.

This legacy comes to us then as a great challenge, a challenge which is being nobly met by many in the Church to-day. It calls us to adventurous thinking and adventurous living; it is a call which will not let men rest until the Kingdoms of this world have indeed become the Kingdom of the Lord.

IRIS CORBIN.

THE MAY MEETINGS.

To the Editor.

Sir,

There must have been many who attended the Peace Meeting at the City Temple on Tuesday, 14th May, who like myself were disturbed by the early departure of a number of people who attended the meeting. The meeting commenced at 7 o'clock, and as from 8.30 there was a frequent stream of departures. One can hardly suppose that last trains can be leaving at so early an hour as 8.30, and the need for these departures is not apparent. It was disturbing to those who wished to hear the second address and was obviously so to the speaker himself, who during the latter part of his address was clearly hurrying to his conclusion and losing thereby a part of its effect.

I suggest that it is not too much to ask those who wish to attend a meeting concluding at so reasonable an hour as 9 o'clock to remain until the close, out of consideration for other people who wish to hear what is said and particularly for the speaker, unless they are compelled by some urgent and unavoidable cause to leave, in which case less disturbance would be caused by their departure during the interval between the speeches.

Yours faithfully,

L. A. BENHAM.

ON LIFE AND BOOKS.

EITHER—OR.

No, sir, this is not going to be an exposition of the Barthian theology; such themes are for the weightier pages of this journal. I merely want to chat about the tantalizing way life has of presenting alternatives, often equally desirable. So skilfully is this done, so equally balanced the boons offered, that Herakles himself had not a harder choice to make, and it is almost beyond human ingenuity to get the best of both worlds. Long years ago in Oxford two charming little girls came to tea with me. When strawberries appeared the younger of them said, "Oh, mummy, strawberries, with sugar *and* cream. We never have both at home, do we?" Herein is one of "life's little ironies." We can rarely have both sugar and cream with our strawberries.

The other day I returned home after a six weeks' absence during which I had spent some time in Palestine and Syria, had a glimpse of Athens and Corinth, Baalbek and Constantinople, and paid flying visits to Gibraltar and Granada; Cyprus and Rhodes; Naples and Pompeii; the islands of Malta and Sicily, and the coast of North Africa. Impression had been piled on impression, misconceptions had been removed, old ideas corrected, new ideas received. They had been days of delight, full, not merely of sightseeing, but of the rest that comes from change. And yet while part of one's being longed to go on, what a joy it was to be nearing home again. Time after time Dean Stanley's words, spoken in Westminster Abbey after a visit to Russia, came into my mind, when he said that his experiences had brought home to him, first, the inestimable advantages of foreign travel, and second, that there was no place like home. It may be, of course, that in the near future we shall be able to stay within the family circle with the sights and sounds of different lands all about us. Not only that, but science may bring to us at the same time Southern sunshine and the ocean's invigorating breezes, so that those who fear the sea will be able to stay at home and travel at the same time! But I scarcely think so. Either—Or seems too engrained in the nature of things for that.

One of my good resolutions when I was away was to begin to read immediately books concerned with the lands I had visited. Especially did I want to read the Bible and books about the archæology of Palestine. I determined to make a study of excavation, and to learn the story behind those massive ruins at Baalbek. Athens, of course, made me unhappily aware how my stock of classical knowledge, always scanty, had diminished with the years, and I determined to replenish it; that charming island of Rhodes, speaking eloquently of past days—certainly I must know with greater precision its history; the vague ideas I had about the eruption of Vesuvius and the destruction of Pompeii and Herculaneum must be replaced by fuller knowledge; Granada and Avignon, Constantinople and Damascus, how much there was about them all that I did not know! Even of British Gibraltar and Malta I found I had much to learn, while of Algiers and its pirates I had but the haziest of notions. The sight of those beaches of Gallipoli where thousands of my contemporaries had been thrown into the very jaws of death made me desire to read again of that disastrous campaign which the courage of men made into an epic. I returned, therefore, fully resolved to give the first weeks of my reading to books suggested by my journeyings.

Alas, I had forgotten that during the six weeks I had been away the world had not been standing still, least of all the publishing world. It had slipped my memory that readers of this journal insist on having a conspectus of books published during the quarter, and that while that conspectus was complete up to the beginning of February it would be very much behind on the 19th of March. Books of all sorts and shapes and sizes had simply poured in, and any chance there had been of carrying out the resolutions made on shipboard soon disappeared. True, I *have* seen the inside of a Bible during that period, and even turned the pages of George Adam Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land;* true, I have read again Mr. Masefield's account of the Gallipoli campaign and Lytton's *Last Days of Pompeii.* But that is about as far as I have gone. Instead it has been one long struggle to reduce the number of books with yellow, blue, and green jackets piled on my table, and even yet the prospect of getting to the course of reading planned is remote indeed.

That "Either—Or" is one which is continually before the editor and reviewer. The more new books come to me the stronger becomes the desire to read the old. When I was far from London, engaged in research work and in ordinary pastoral life, my longing was to be abreast of modern scholarship. I thought how splendid it would be to be able to see all the books noticed in the *Times Literary Supplement* and in the literary publications. Now the position is reversed, and I find myself at times longing for release from all reviewing and freedom to follow my tastes. The superior person who said that whenever a new book was published he read an old one neither spoke the truth nor talked sense, though one sees what his hyperbole was getting at. Indeed, when I think of the old books I have been wanting to read for the last three years, I can understand why he spoke with such extravagance. Life is short and books are many, and fortunate are they who can browse at will among old or new. The prodigality of the world of letters brings its own difficulties: so vast is the ocean and our pails are so small. Perhaps the best plan is to give the early and middle years to the endeavour to keep abreast of modern literature, and the later years to old and favourite vintages. But it looks as if here, at any rate, Either—Or is inevitable.

Can the problem of Either—Or be solved in other spheres? Must it always be town *versus* country, for example? It is a truism to say that when one has once lived in London one can be happy nowhere else. But is there any Londoner other than Charles Lamb who has not sighed for woodland and mountain, the scent of hay or burning wood, the song of birds and the music of a rippling stream? To live among men and books, to be in contact with those who make history, to feel the throb of an Empire's heart—that cannot but appeal to a thinking being. And yet! And yet! To be far from the madding crowd, on moors where peewits call and on mountains where one follows a sheep track and feels the lure of the distant summit—who does not long for these things? Does Mr. Edmund Blunden get the best of both worlds? Here is what Mr. Frank Swinnerton says about him:

> The truth is that Blunden is by nature a pastoral poet and a bookman. He loves old books. . . If he had his way, he would dwell in a countryside peopled (besides the hinds and hodges and birds and beasts) with Lamb, Hazlitt, Leigh Hunt, and the men of their hour.

Must it be Either—Or? Must we be townsmen *or* countrymen? Or will the car and the plane enable us to be both?

Is it possible for a man to be at one and the same time critical and creative? I wonder. Does not too keen a critical sense react unfavour-

ably on creative work? How rarely is the scientist an artist as well. Few there be like Sir J. G. Frazer whose contributions to science are made in a style that any man of letters might envy. Schiller wrote to a friend who complained of lack of creative power:

> The reason lies . . . in the constraint which your intellect imposes upon your imagination. . . You reject too soon and discriminate too severely.

Or take the antithesis between authority and freedom of which so much has been heard in recent years. Can men at one and the same time have the privileges of independence and the advantages of discipline? Or must Colonel Lawrence assume another personality and become Aircraftsman Shaw to secure a life of routine, an escape from the perils into which an adventurous mind might lead, a haven from uncertain storms?

Many more are the alternatives which suggest themselves. Is the freedom to be found "when a man's single" to be preferred to the joys of home and family life? Should one give the hostages to fortune that marriage involves, or live to one's self, with the loneliness and lack of comradeship that bachelordom entails? Jacob Wassermann, whose untimely death has taken from the world a novelist Germany in her folly rejected, puts the case thus:

> One who lives alone can retain self-command and is answerable only for himself or herself. Those whose lives are joined in couples are subject to other laws. The twofold being has imposed upon it restrictions owing to which the paths the members of the pair might have chosen had they lived apart are modified, be it only physically, as by the influence of gravity.

But this is to embark upon a subject almost as serious and certainly as difficult as the Barthian theology. And, as I said at the beginning, not in these ——— pages!

ALBERT PEEL.

The entertaining sketches Mr. T. Thompson contributes to the *Manchester Guardian* win a warm welcome from everything he writes. He has not yet, however, mastered the art of the larger novel. Until Zach becomes Mayor, *Song O'Sixpence* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is quite a good story of a self-made Lancashire man, but after that it tumbles to pieces. It must be said, however, that Mr. Thompson knows his Lancashire and Lancashire folk.

Means Test Man (Methuen, 7s. 6d.) is from the pen of Mr. Walter Brierley, formerly an unemployed Derbyshire miner. It tells in vivid and poignant fashion the story of a week in an unemployed miner's home, showing how the strain of living on "the dole" causes man and wife to get on each other's nerves, and how it affects their child. Mr. Brierley writes well and this narrative is full of promise.

Mr. H. G. Bates's *The Poacher* (Cape, 7s. 6d.) is the first of his works we have read. It is called by the publisher "a tragedy of English rural life," and in its pages Mr. Bates does convey the atmosphere of the land. The Bishops, father and son, are alive—very much so—but Mr. Bates's women are not so successful.

We have next to eliminate those doctrines which Jesus did not teach. They are not necessarily untrue; for many true things are not to be found among the recorded sayings of Christ; but they are not part of *his* Christianity, and therefore they are not binding on those who follow him.

Jesus Christ says nothing about predestination or election, and gives no opening for the doctrine of original sin. Indeed he has no doctrine of sin at all, and that is one of his chief innovations on Judaism: he is fully aware of the evil that men do, but the word "sin" is never on his lips; it is forgiveness that he teaches, without any technique of penance; but he requires a *"metanoia,"* a "change of mind" which is sharp and absolute, though this cannot have meant to him what "repentance" means to us, for he applied it to himself in accepting John's baptism—not sackcloth and ashes but a new orientation. There is no suggestion of sin as an abstract reality, an "endless breach requiring an endless reparation," and consequently no angered God demanding satisfaction, no bloody propitiation, no "doctrine of the cross," no theory or system of atonement, no theology of retribution or justification. When men have tried to explain the fact of their salvation through Christ they have done so as best they could in their own way—not in his. They have always differed deeply among themselves; and we are not required to accept any of their sometimes immoral explanations. The most grossly immoral of their teachings was that about hell; and here I have only time to state the fact—Jesus did not preach eternal punishment, for the principle of penalties was not in his message; and so strongly did his followers feel this lack of ferocity that one editor added his phrase about "weeping and gnashing of teeth" to no less than five of the Parables in Matthew.

PERCY DEARMER, *Christianity as a New Religion.*

Even the worst of life proves the story true. Sometimes the religious say that our sorrows and calamities come upon us in God's inscrutable providence. But to those who believe that they are prodigals in a far country that is incredible, all but blasphemy; meaningless, as though God were not Love; as though it were His will to hurt us.

If God is almighty Love, and our world sins against Love, how can it be a happy place? If we men live passionately in our own interests, what else can we expect but failure and misery? We are contending against God and our Fate. The Love of God is indeed the cause of our evils, because we fight against it. If I threw myself from a high wall, offending against natural law, I should not complain of its injustice. If I offend against almighty Love, is it, then, unjust that I should suffer? If I live in a far country not yet obedient to Love, is Love to blame because there is pain here, and sadness and death? And I am not fit for a better world, nor have any right to demand it. If we and our world do all that love forbids, struggle against others, survive by violence, go to war, hate and compete and lust after possessions, is it not certain that we must pay the penalty? And who is to blame? Ourselves, or God? We may not blame Him because He is Love: we can blame only ourselves, and our world which offends against His nature. Our human sufferings and evils are no inscrutable providence, they are what surely happens to any creature which separates itself from Love; they are the sign to any prodigal that he is in estrangement from Love; a sinner, among sinners, in a far country. If we loved one another, we say, there would be no war, but goodwill

among men, peace and prosperity. If we loved one another, there would be no more slums nor ignorance nor brutal inequalities in society, no jealousies nor covetousness, no trampling ambitions, no grasping after wealth—we all know that; it is obvious; but we do not consider why it is so, why there is no happiness without Love—because God is Love. If there are happy worlds, but others, like ours, are sad and outcast, subject to evil and mortality, it is because there they love, but here we still offend, of our own will, against God's Nature and our Fate.

H. B. Shepheard, *This Far Country.*

Of this cult [of the primitive] D. H. Lawrence is at once the apologist and the priest. He has given it its most notable literary expression; he has also provided it with its Bible. Going to Mexico to get local colour for his revolt against civilization, he found the perfect type of humanity in men in whom the intellect was demonstrably subordinate to the stomach, the genitals, and the solar plexus. The perfect Lawrencian man has subjected his intellect to these fundamental organs and to the psychological growths which are rooted in them; indeed, it is not too much to say that his intellect is literally in his guts. This, at least, seems to be the meaning of those lyrical passages in which Lawrence raves over a dusky

> abdomen where the great blood stream surges in the dark and surges in its own generic experience . . . it is the dark blood falling back from the mind, from sight and speech and knowing, back to the great central source where is rest and unspeakable renewal.

Abjuring as artificial reason and the life of the intellect, subsiding into "the great blood stream which surges in the dark" of the abdomen and the genitals, man renews his being and becomes one with the ultimate reality of things.

And the ultimate reality of things? It is nothing more nor less than God. Hence, to abjure the intellect is to become divine. "I can become one with God, consummated into eternity," Lawrence declares, "by taking the road down the senses into the utter darkness of power, till I am one with the darkness of initial power, beyond knowledge of any opposite." The last phrase has a familiar ring. We seem to be listening to the cry of one of the great Christian mystics, to Madame Guyon, or St. John of the Cross, struggling through the "Dark Night of the Soul." . . . . But what for the mystics was a painful and humiliating prerequisite of union, a stage one had regrettably to undergo, is apparently for Lawrence the goal itself. While they looked upwards for the divine, finding the uniting thread in the ecstasies of the developed spirit, Lawrence looks downwards and finds it in the orgasms of the excited genitals. The consciousness of the enraptured mystic is lost in God; that of Lawrence's idealized Mexican with "face lifted and sightless, eyes half closed and visionless, mouth open and speechless" is sunk in "the abdomen."

C. E. M. Joad, *Return to Philosophy.*

"Instead of baptism, I have the church come together, bring the infant in, explain in German the gospel, 'They brought little children,' then a name is given him, the whole church prays for the child with bended knees, and commends him to Christ, that He will be gracious and intercede for him. But if the parents are still weak, and positively wish that the child be baptized, then I baptize it; and I am weak with the weak for the time being until they are better instructed. As to the Word, however, I do not yield to them in the least point . . . . "

Zwingli, quoted in R. J. Smithson, *The Anabaptists.*

FOREIGN REVIEWS.

Jesus der Herr. Die Führervollmacht Jesu und die Gottesoffenbarung in Christus. von KARL HEIM. Berlin: Furche-Verlag. 10s. 6d.

Jesus and the Word. By RUDOLF BULTMANN. Translated by L. P. SMITH and E. HUNTRESS. Nicholson & Watson. 6s.

There are few, if any, theologians of our time who have more to teach us than Karl Heim. Yet in this country, even to most academic theologians, he is little known. This may be due partly to the distinctiveness of his thought. His chief concern has been with the nature of faith's certainty, and that is a problem which English theologians tend to pass by. One small book of his has, indeed, been translated into English, but it is a book which gives little indication of the special significance of his teaching.

Some of us who owe Heim much heard with eager expectation that he was writing a *magnum opus* in three volumes which should bring into one coherent whole what he has taught in his many writings.

The first volume of this great work appeared in 1931. The book had as its title *The Evangelical Faith and the Thought of the Present,* the first volume being called *Faith and Thought*. It says much for Heim's influence in Germany and for the seriousness with which at any rate some Germans still study theology that in three months 4,000 copies were sold, and it is now in its eleventh thousand. And yet it is a very difficult book concerned with the ultimate problems of philosophy. Heim uses philosophy not as a support to theology but to show that philosophy has nothing certain to say on final issues. Only as Christian philosophy thus fulfils this negative task can revelation do its work.

Heim promised a second volume, *Faith in Christ,* and a concluding volume, *The Christian Faith in God and the Natural Science of To-day*. Only the first part of this second volume is as yet published. It is to be completed in a work entitled, *Jesus der Weltvollender*. The book before us, *Jesus the Lord,* has as its sub-title *The All-power of Jesus the Leader and the Revelation of God in Christ*. We are familiar through recent controversy with the antithesis, Jesus, Leader or Lord? To Heim such an alternative would be meaningless. Jesus is the Leader to whom "all power is given in heaven and on earth." Against the totalitarian claim of the State there is thus presented the "totalitarian" claim of Jesus.

The first section of the book deals with *The "Unknown God," the negative Presupposition for the Understanding of the Full-power of Christ as Leader*. This section sums up the conclusions of the first volume. It begins with the discussion of *The general Need for a Foundation of Thought and Action*. Heim points out that the question which confronts us to-day is not that of the Reformation, How can I gain a gracious God?, nor that of the eighteenth century which, because of the earthquake at Lisbon, was concerned with God's rule of the universe. The decisive question to-day is more radical. It asks whether the whole discussion of religion has any serious meaning. Far more godless than the atheism of the nineteenth century is this secularism for which the question of God's existence has ceased to have any content; and this secularism is within as without the Church.

Idealism and rationalism alike tempt us to make of God a figment of our imagination. Speculation can reach the idea of a first Cause. But this is not God; it is rather what Luther calls an idol; or we can follow the way of

Indian mysticism and speak of the Divine as the attributeless absolute of being. In that way, too, God is not reached. Christianity came into existence because a small but gradually increasing number of men reached the certainty that there is a way to God which God has given. We have a Leader, Jesus of Nazareth. He is Leader and Lord. Instead of seeking to lead ourselves, we can be led by Him. We pass here from the "I—it" relationship of science, to the relationship of "I—thou." Instead of a law, there is a Person. Our Leader does not belong to the past alone. He is our contemporary. We are now in the "I—thou" relationship with Him.

As Heim points out, the nearest analogy to the early Christian ascription of Lordship to Jesus lay, not in mystery-cults, but in the title, *Lord,* given to the Roman Emperor. This leadership is, says Heim, easier to understand to-day. The great movements of our time no longer centre round ideas. They centre in persons like Lenin, Gandhi, or Mussolini, who have the qualities of the Leader (*der Führer*). Leadership is no longer a title or an office. What makes a man a leader is not a programme, a world-view or an ethic. True leadership depends on the person of the leader. The devotion to "the Leader" (*der Führer*) in Germany, to *il duce* in Italy, is some analogy to the cults of "Lords" which Christianity had at the first to meet. But Christ is Leader, (*Führer*), Lord, in a deeper sense, for His leadership concerns not a part of our existence but its whole.

To such a claim there can be only two answers. We can reject the claim and see in it merely the fanaticism of the first followers of Jesus. We may not say, "Let every man according to the old Prussian tradition be saved in his own way." If the Christian claim be based on an illusion, then at this time of national crisis the maintenance of Christianity ought to be forbidden as a useless dissipation of power damaging to the community and perilous to the State. There is another answer. The claim of Jesus is true. If that be so, then under the leadership of Christ we may gain the right understanding for the fate of our people, for the significance of the racial struggle, for the opposition between Judaism and Germanism. His leadership is then decisive in every sphere. We have to choose. A "Lord" in the full sense of the word we can, as Jesus said in the Sermon on the Mount, only "love" or "hate," "cleave to" or "despise." Thus the "scandal" of the Christian message did not begin with the Cross. It began with the demand that we should accept the leadership of another.

Idealism cannot help us. German Idealism expressed man's desire to be free and master of his fate. It was like the song of home which Blondel sang to Richard Coeur-de-Lion, a song whose one effect would be to make the king more painfully aware that he was far from home, languishing in captivity.

The third section of the book deals with *The primal Guilt as the deepest Ground why we need a Leader.* The blindness to God of our intellect and our practical experience of being far from God belong together. For both we are responsible, and both are to be assigned to that Satanic power we find depicted in the world-view of Jesus. That I am separated from God is my own guilt. It is derived from the Satanic will which is my will and which separates itself from God. To the question, how is God related to this Satanic power, Heim answers, He uses it and yet is in strife against it. Our individual sin is related to that primal guilt. And redemption concerns not only individual men, but victory over the power of darkness.

The last section of the book speaks of *The Revelation of God in Christ.* That revelation has not come to us through a philosophic tract or a collection of moral sayings, but through the record of a great event. "God has

spoken." That is the message of the New Testament. God has spoken through His Son. We cannot put Jesus into a pantheon of the religious leaders of the race, by the side of men like Buddha, Confucius, or Plato. Heim reverts to his distinction between the relation of the "I" to the "it," and the relation of the "I" to the "thou." Our relationship to Christ is of the second kind. He can be to us to-day the Word of God made flesh because this "thou" relationship with Him is possible. That means that we stand in a relationship of contemporaneity with Him. To judge otherwise would be to accuse Christians of all ages of self-delusion, and to be ourselves still without a Leader.

Heim proceeds to give a much needed warning against a misrepresentation of Christianity very common in modern preaching. It is a perilous delusion to speak as if Jesus through His coming had brought us into immediate access to God, and had solved the world-riddle in the simplest and most optimistic manner, for He has shown us that above the starry sky a good Father dwells. It was the belief that this picture of the good Father-God is Christianity which led, at the time of the War, especially, to the estrangement of many of the best men from the Christianity of the Churches. This superficial faith was shattered for them by their war-experiences. Heim quotes the bitter words of a German novelist who speaks of this "dear, good, old God" as lying dead beneath the corpses of those who in Russia died of typhus. Heim adds, had Jesus given His disciples this optimistic faith in this Father-God, then this Father-God would have fallen first, not in the world-war, but when Christians were burnt as faggots in Nero's garden and Christian maidens given over to the Praetorian soldiers in the circus. Instead, He had warned them of such sufferings. They could die with Christ to rise again to Him. "He that has seen me, has seen the Father." And this Christ we see is the Christ who upon the Cross cried out, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."

It would have better pleased our pride if God had given us a map so that we could find our way ourselves. Instead, God has given us a Leader, and said, "You must always keep behind this Man. He will show you the way; you need not separate yourselves from Him, like sheep without a shepherd." And this can be, because Christ belongs not to the past alone, but to our present.

A brief summary such as we have given cannot express the full power and significance of this deeply moving book. We have found it of the greatest interest. Much in it is alien from our idiom and it is written with a sombreness which is as yet unusual in British theology. Heim writes as one conscious of the grave crisis of Christianity in his country. But the very distinctiveness of the book increases for us its value. We are compelled to face anew the question, Have we a word great and grave enough to meet the needs of our age? Is the Christianity we preach that of Christ, and so the word men need to hear, or is it a Christianity still obscured by pre-war optimism and idealism? We live in a time of crisis; do we so preach as to force upon men a decision?

Bultmann's *Jesus and the Word* shows in another way the sense of crisis. The first edition of the German original, *Jesus,* was published in 1926 in a popular series giving the lives of some of the world's great personalities. We read the book when it appeared, and it did not seem to us to have much to say to a British audience. It was obviously written for those who knew little of the Gospels, and in consequence contained very long quotations even from their most familiar chapters. Yet, at the same

time, the book was written with a scepticism which seemed excessive and over-confident. We have not that first edition by us, but, if our memory be not at fault, this second edition is less meagre and negative. The translators have wisely changed the title to *Jesus and the Word*. Bultmann denies that any clear impression can be formed of the career or personality of Jesus, and concentrates on His teaching. Bultmann speaks in this as an extreme representative of the *Formgeschichte* School, and is far too dogmatic in his denials. His account of the teaching of Jesus may serve a useful purpose if it leads its readers to abandon that "modernized" conception of the Kingdom of God which is derived not from Jesus but from pre-war liberalism. The Kingdom of God is "supernatural, super-historical; and while men can receive its salvation, can enter it, it is not they, with their fellowship, and their activity, who constitute the Kingdom, but God's power alone." The Kingdom is that "transcendent event which signifies for man the ultimate Either-Or, which constrains him to decision." It is in this that the interest of Bultmann's book lies. We have had books enough, arbitrary as this book is, in the rejection of various incidents and sayings in the Gospel records. But Bultmann's book is saved from academic irrelevancy by its Barthian insistence on the Either-Or.

> In the word, and not otherwise, does Jesus bring forgiveness. Whether his word is truth, whether he is sent from God—that is the decision to which the hearer is constrained, and the word of Jesus remains, "Blessed is he who finds no cause of offence in me."

SYDNEY CAVE.

The Two Sources of Morality and Religion. By HENRI BERGSON. Macmillan. 10s.

This is a really great book. The publishers describe it as the fruit of a life's work, and in the original French it has gone through seventeen editions since it was first published in 1932. It marks the completion and practical application of that philosophy of change which M. Bergson first set forth in *Creative Evolution*. The main theme of the book has to do with the respective parts played by instinct and intelligence in the development of human life and society and particularly in morality and religion.

In his first chapter, "Moral Obligation," M. Bergson deals with the familiar problem of the origin and methods of ethics. He believes that all morality is in essence biological, but it may be either static or dynamic. The purely static morality might be called infra-intellectual, and the purely dynamic, supra-intellectual, and, continues M. Bergson,

> nature intended the one, and the other is a contribution of man's genius. The former is characteristic of a whole group of habits which are, in man, the counterpart of certain instincts in animals; it is something less than intelligence. The latter is inspiration, intuition, emotion, susceptible of analysis into ideas which furnish intellectual notation of it and branch out into infinite detail.

At the same time society is only one of the aspects of life. The individual has his own place in it and, while in a sense existing for it, has his own part to play.

In the next two chapters M. Bergson deals with religion, first in its static and secondly in its dynamic form. Static religion he regards as the religion of nature, which manifests itself in myth-making, ritual, dogma, and the like, and he defines it finally as

> a defensive reaction of nature against what might be depressing for the individual, and dissolvent for society, in the exercise of intelligence.

Static religion has its part to play in man's development as a social and

moral being. It is part of that vital impetus which secures his position in the universe and lifts him above the merely natural world. By dynamic religion M. Bergson means simply mysticism which

> lifts the soul to another plane and ensures for the soul to a pre-eminent degree the security and the serenity which it is the function of static religion to provide.

True mysticism, however, is very rare, and though man reaches out for it and desires it, he will still mainly turn to static religion for the support and inspiration that he needs. If we seek a formula for mysticism it is simply this, "God is love and the object of love." Creative energy is to be defined as love, and "beings have been called into existence who were destined to love and be loved."

The last chapter deals with "Mechanics and Mysticism," and the pith of it is in the following words:

> what we need are new reserves of potential energy—moral energy this time. So let us not merely say, as we did above, that the mystical summons up the mechanical. We must add that the body, now larger, calls for a bigger soul, and that mechanism should mean mysticism. The origins of the process of mechanization are indeed more mystical than we might imagine. Machinery will find its true vocation again, it will render services in proportion to its power, only if mankind, which it has bowed still lower to the earth, can succeed, through it, in standing erect and looking heavenwards.

What we have said so far gives no idea of the wealth of material in this book. Everything is fish that comes into M. Bergson's net, and he certainly touches nothing that he does not adorn. Whether one agrees with him or not, his treatment of fundamental problems, both ancient and modern, is always illuminating and gives food for thought. The translators of the book—Ashley Audra, Cloudesley Brereton, and W. Horsfall Carter—have done their work well. They have succeeded in rendering M. Bergson's limpid French into equally clear English.

W. B. Selbie.

God's Search for Man (Clark, 6s.) is another volume of sermons by Prof. Karl Barth and the Rev. Eduard Thurneysen. The translation, which has been approved by Prof. Barth, is by the American group which translated *Come, Holy Spirit*—Drs. G. W. Richards, E. G. Homrighausen, and Karl J. Ernst.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

"Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider."—FRANCIS BACON.

"A good book is the precious life-blood of a master spirit, embalmed and treasured up on purpose to a life beyond life."—JOHN MILTON.

(*The place of publication is London and the date* 1935 *unless otherwise stated.*)

The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. By GEORGE S. DUNCAN, D.D. Hodder. 8s. 6d.

This is a book as timely as it is welcome. "The natural man," as Sohm said, "is a born Catholic," and as long as man remains man, the Epistle to the Galatians will be needed as the Magna Charta of evangelical freedom. The Christian Gospel is independent of law, convention, or race; salvation comes by faith alone, faith that leads inevitably to love, for it is faith in the Son of God crucified for us; we are free from men because the bondservants of Christ; living in the Spirit we are free from law. These are truths easily forgotten. It was not an accident that Luther found in this Epistle the foundation of the Reformation. "The Epistle to the Galatians is my epistle, I have betrothed myself to it; it is my wife." But as the history of the Reformation and of our own Churches shows, it is not easy even for Protestants and Free Churchmen to remain loyal to its teaching. The time is ripe for a re-emphasis on the message of this Epistle which might restore to us the freedom and the fervour of evangelical Christianity.

But only as we understand the Epistle in relation to the problems of its age can we rightly appropriate its meaning for ours. The Epistle is one that needs a commentary, and there are already some admirable commentaries in English. Some of us who owed our first understanding of Paul to reading Lightfoot's commentaries in the Greek New Testament class at school can never forget Lightfoot's work. It utilized the best scholarship of its day, but since then the investigation of the forms of thought of Paul's time has revolutionized the scientific study of his epistles. That new knowledge is well set out in Burton's Commentary in the *I.C.C.*, but the mass of lexicographical material in that book renders it forbidding to the "working minister", and, besides, makes its price prohibitive to most. This new commentary gives in simplest possible form just what is needed for the understanding of the Epistle, and Professor Duncan is so much at home in the vast literature of Pauline studies that he is able to write with complete lucidity.

Professor Duncan accepts the South Galatian theory, and can thus regard the Epistle as the earliest of Paul's we have. But this commentary, unlike some on this Epistle, is not unduly concerned with this kind of problem. Always its author writes as one who remembers that he is dealing with a great religious classic which has much to say to us as well as to Paul's readers. We have read this book with great appreciation. It will deepen faith and revivify preaching. In it we can hear Paul speaking to his age, and learn from him what our age needs much to hear.

SYDNEY CAVE.

The Growth and Structure of the Gospels. By B. K. Rattey. Oxford Press. 2s. 6d.

The Earlier Pauline Epistles. By E. A. Gardiner. Rivingtons. 4s.

Letters to the Apostles. By Helen Walker Homan. Burns, Oates. 6s.

Miss Rattey's little book is a useful introduction to its subject. Each Gospel receives a chapter and the quaternion is hebdomized by chapters on The Preparation, The Forerunners (where *Formgeschichte* is remarkably absent), and The Canon. I did not find quite the same freshness and vivacity as in Miss Rattey's earlier book, *A Short History of the Hebrews,* possibly through familiarity with Dr. Vincent Taylor's little masterpiece on the Gospels and through recent reading of Dr. J. H. Ropes's stimulating volume on the Synoptists. But the book before us fills a niche of its own; it is informative and scholarly yet not over-technical, and should find many appreciative readers.

I have been so pleased with Mr. Gardiner's book that I have ordered his earlier volumes on the Gospels and *Acts*. The sixth form at King Edward VI School, Louth, are fortunate in having so skilled an interpreter of the *N.T.* In this very compact book Mr. Gardiner deals with *Gal., 1 and 2 Cor., 1 and 2 Thess.*, and *Rom.*, printing the R.V. text and supplying just what is necessary in the way of introduction to each epistle, explanatory essays to each section, and notes. One could not wish for a better compendium; the critical questions are handled with sound judgment and lucidity. The book might well be placed on the schedule for one of our List A Examinations, and college students, too, as well as a wider circle would find it of high value.

Mrs. Homan, "well known among modern American writers for the gaiety and charm of her writings," presents us with quite a different aspect of *N.T.* study. It is an American Catholic "Book of the Month," and quite unlike anything I have ever seen before. The author's favourite is Peter, which is not unnatural in one of the Roman persuasion. These letters are a quaint blend of history and legend, and are interesting as gathering together fact and fiction. James, the son of Alpheus, is identified with James the Just (epistle writer and "bishop"), Thaddeus or Lebbæus with Jude (epistle writer). Judas Iscariot is only addressed indirectly (through Mark); Paul and Luke are admitted to the circle. The style may be illustrated from the opening words of the letter to Philip:

> Now don't take offence, St. Philip—you of Bethsaida of Galilee, and one of the most delightful of the delightful twelve—when I say the ladies liked you.

Incidentally Mrs. Homan seems—like some early Christian writers—to have confused Philip the Apostle with the "deacon" of the same name. Incidentally also it would be refreshing to have the apostles' opinions of Mrs. Homan.

Alex. J. Grieve.

Footnotes to St. Paul. By C. A. Anderson Scott. Cambridge Press. 7s. 6d.

There is no better guide to the teaching of the great apostle than Professor Anderson Scott, whose *Christianity according to St. Paul* has found many appreciative readers. In this little volume, which is obviously not a "new translation," but less obviously not "a commentary," he gathers up the fruits of life-long study, and presents to a wider public what has hitherto been the privilege of the class room. He begins with *Philemon*, as offering "the best way of approach to the study of Paul's inter-

pretation of Christianity and its application to life," and then takes the epistles in their *N.T.* order, omitting the Pastorals.

After a brief introduction to each epistle there are notes which practically amount to a commentary, and so the book is really a *multum in parvo*. *Romans* and *1 Cor.* together naturally occupy half the whole space; the treatment of *2 Cor.* seems, but only seems, slight, compared with that of *1 Cor.* Here and there the notes are comparatively lengthy, *e.g.*, on Salvation, Grace, Predestination. There is an index of these, and together they form a valuable compendium of Pauline theology. A concluding essay deals with "Paul's message to his fellow men." The book is one that every student and preacher should add to his library.

ALEX. J. GRIEVE.

The Unfinished Universe. By T. S. GREGORY. Faber & Faber. 8s. 6d.

Mr. Gregory wrote this book as a Methodist minister and has since joined the Roman Church. The book is therefore a kind of apologia, or at least a preparation for one, and indicates clearly enough that the writer has no alternative but to become a Roman Catholic. To Mr. Gregory the great enemy is science and the scientific view of the universe. He regards it as idealistic and magical as opposed to the religious interpretation which is alone real. From this point of view he sets forth a kind of philosophy of history in which the whole Greek contribution to the human story comes in for some very hard treatment. Both the Renaissance and the Reformation also come under his condemnation. The only good outcome of the Middle Ages is the Roman Church, and only in obedience to Rome are men likely to find happiness and peace. Mr. Gregory is a forcible and lively writer, and however much one may disagree with him one cannot but follow the course of his argument with interest and attention. He passes a great many slap-dash judgments which history would hardly confirm and he shows his bias in his treatment of Protestantism and especially of Puritanism. He despairs of the modern world which is the result of a mixture of Whiggery and Puritanism—"They met in London and were married there about the end of the seventeenth century." The modern mind is even worse—

> The modernist pursues his investigation with remorseless self-denial and scientific humility; without hope and without despair but not without universities.

The following words are a good example of his rather naïve defence of the Roman position:

> Rome was the world of Jesus. Mary was his Mother. What the rejection of Rome has meant in politics, the neglect and contempt of Our Lady has meant in piety. "To fail," says an Anglo-Catholic, "in giving Our Lady that place in our thought and devotions which God gave to her in choosing her to be the Mother of His Son, with all that such a choice involved, is to fail in our modern understanding not only of her but of Jesus." The history of the past 400 years is sufficient proof of that statement.

That there is another side to all this Mr. Gregory seems hardly to realize.

W. B. SELBIE.

The Ethics of Power. By PHILLIP LEON. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

Mr. Leon is already well known as a teacher of philosophy and as a writer on philosophical subjects. This is his first big book, and it may be said at once that it is a very real and welcome contribution to ethical studies. Its sub-title is "The Problem of Evil," but neither this nor the title conveys any very accurate idea of the aim and scope of the work as a whole. Mr.

Leon claims that he is dealing with a comparatively neglected branch of moral philosophy, and he says his book

> has for its essential theme not goodness but the much more interesting and perplexing subject evil or moral evil.

This does not mean that it seeks to solve what is commonly called the problem of evil but that it approaches morality from the negative rather than from the positive side. Mr. Leon contends that

> if it were not for man's moralities, for his idealisms and religions and "oughts," three-quarters of the evil in the world would not exist. Hence the necessity for a concrete, detailed and therefore inevitably lengthy exposition of the various forms of evil, especially of those which are hidden under the appearance of good.

The root of all evil, Mr. Leon finds in what he calls egotism. This he distinguishes, after a good deal of rather meticulous argumentation, from egoism, and identifies it practically with what is generally known as human nature. It represents the supreme urge to action and hence the ethics of power. Mr. Leon describes the various forms which egotism takes both in individuals and in society with its varied expressions in man's social and moral life. He states the conclusion of the whole matter thus :

> For the firmest enunciation of this morality (the only morality) we must go to the Judaeo-Christian tradition with its realization of God who is personality and Love and Goodness and before whom no man is great or, which is the same thing, all are equally great, with its Old Testament in which there is no hero and with its New Testament in which lowliness and, indeed, ignominy itself are assumed into divinity. The enunciation is in terms of religion only because all moral vision is also religious or metaphysical vision just as moral perversion is also religious or metaphysical perversion.

Mr. Leon is a lively and interesting writer and very skilful in drawing illustrations from modern literature and life. Even those quite unversed in philosophy will find it well worth their while to read him.

W. B. Selbie.

Has the Kingdom of God Arrived? By the Lord Bishop of London. Unicorn Press. 2s. 6d.

The Quest for Happiness. By C. H. K. Boughton, B.D. Hodder. 2s. 6d.

The Fourth River. By K. E. Kirk, D.D. Skeffington. 3s. 6d.

Founded upon a Rock. By Bede Frost, O.S.B. Centenary Press. 3s. 6d.

Here are four volumes of sermons of very varying styles and of very varying merit. I do not know that any one of them suggests to me great *preaching,* unless it be the last. For a great sermon does not necessarily mean great preaching. When I was a student certain volumes of sermons by a Wesleyan minister enjoyed a considerable vogue. As written sermons they were admirable. But it was whispered that no circuit was particularly desirous of having their author for minister—for the simple reason that, though he could compose excellent sermons, he could not preach. Preaching, said Phillips Brooks, in an often-quoted sentence, is truth through personality. It is the preacher bringing his own personality, his own faith and passionate conviction, to bear upon the people who sit in the pews. A great sermonizer, therefore—just because he cannot bring the impact of his personality to bear upon his hearers—need not therefore be a great preacher. Perhaps from the preaching point of view the sermons in the weakest of these books may have been the most effective.

The first, by the Bishop of London, is a slender little volume containing a number of sermons which the Bishop apparently preached last autumn. They are meant to "answer the materialism very prevalent in some quarters to-day." The sermons themselves are as slight as the volume. The Bishop does not set out to be a theologian, and the thought of the sermons is not very coherent. Whether they are effective as an antidote to the prevailing materialism is more than doubtful, but the Bishop's kindly and genial spirit breathes through these simple addresses, and I can readily believe that they proved more helpful to their hearers than the sermons in the other and more pretentious volumes.

The second book, by Canon Boughton, of Leicester, is a series of sermons upon the Parable of the Prodigal Son. There is a good deal of learning in the sermons, but with their parade of learning they somehow do not seem to fit the simplicity and directness of the exquisite parable they are supposed to expound; though let it be said that they contain a good deal of practical wisdom.

The third volume is by Dr. K. E. Kirk, canon of Christ Church, Oxford. It is entitled *The Fourth River*. The first sermon, with its first text, "the fourth river is the Euphrates" (*Gen.* 2^{14}), illustrates the nature of the book. The sermons are what I should term "ingenious" sermons, and for the most part they are based on unusual texts. The author himself seems to be conscious that he owes his readers some explanation of his choice of curious texts, for in his preface he describes his sermons as sermons "*from* the Bible," not sermons "on" or "about" the Bible. That is to say, certain odd texts of the Bible suggest a certain line of thought, and that line of thought becomes the real theme of the sermon. I cannot confess to any love of this method. A preacher's love of ingenuity may lead him into false interpretations. We have an instance of this in the sermon entitled "Daybreak at the Inn," in which the writer makes the innkeeper an example of responsibility, heroism, and disinterestedness! All this is not to say that there is not good stuff in these sermons. But their "ingenuity" repels me, though for those who like that sort of thing this volume gives them the very thing they like.

Father Bede Frost's *Founded upon a Rock* is in another and different category from the other three. This is a really big book—a book it will profit all ministers to read. The author describes it as an Introduction to the Sermon on the Mount. One sermon, on "Morality or Life," really gets down to rock-bottom. I do not say that everybody will like the book. Father Bede Frost holds staunchly to the faith once delivered to the saints. He has not much patience with the modernistic dilution of Christianity, and he deals faithfully with men like Wells, Shaw, and the Huxleys, whom many are disposed to regard as the prophets of this new age. I do not know that these sermons would be considered "popular": they are too massive and closely reasoned to be that. But they are sermons preachers would do well to ponder in the quiet of their studies. Let preachers get their teeth into them, and their own preaching will be enriched as a result.

J. D. Jones.

Music and Worship. By Walford Davies and Harvey Grace. Eyre & Spottiswoode. 6s.

The practical commonsense and homely humour of the one author and the idealism of the other unite to make this one of the most interesting and helpful books of its kind we have read. We have, we believe, digested practically all the literature on the subject that has appeared during the last ten years, and this book has features of distinction that are not to be

found in any previous work. It is not a technical treatise for the organist, although there are many practical and useful suggestions, neither is it an abstract essay for ministers, although there is much in it that ministers of all denominations could read with advantage. Rather is it a book that has something to say to all interested in the place of music in the church service, to ministers, organists, choir members, and the man in the pew. It gets down to first principles and inquires why, how, and when we should sing, and the answers and solutions to these problems will be found of absorbing interest. So far as it may be said to be founded on one chief thought, its main message is the adequate expression of words in music, as applied to chanting, hymn-singing, responses, and anthems, and even the speaking of prayers by the minister. The authors have, naturally enough, considering their life work, written with the Church of England in mind, but most of what they have to say applies no less strongly to Nonconformists.

It is impossible here to deal fully with all the points raised, but a brief *résumé* of the chapters may give some indication of the scope of the book. The first four chapters deal with the main text mentioned above; then follow sections on "Practical Team Work," with reference to the clergy, organists, and choir, with chapters on "Solos and Soloists," "Congregational Singing" (some uncommonly good things are said here); "Music, Its Choice and Rendering," with chapters on "Chants and Chanting," "Hymns and Hymn Singing" (with some points that needed to be made about the *English Hymnal* and *Songs of Praise*); "At the Communion," "Canticle Settings and Anthems," and "Diocesan and Other Festivals."

We cordially commend this book to all who are conscious of musical shortcomings in church, and are anxious to make the worship side of our service the thing of beauty and joy it so rarely is.

ERIC H. THIMAN.

SHORTER NOTICES AND DESCRIPTIVE LIST.

*(Books marked * are recommended for ministerial reading).*

Bible selections pour forth thick and fast, but they are of varying merit. *A First Bible* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.) is an American production which aims at reproducing the Bible's great stories from the *A.V.* for young and old. Both selection and illustrations are the work of ladies, and we fear they will not attract. The picture of Peter walking on the water shows the Apostle as a bald-headed old man, clad like his Lord in long robes and cape, but without the absurd conventional halo which surrounds the head of Jesus.

The Rev. W. R. Bowie's *The Story of the Bible* (R.T.S., 12s. 6d.) is illustrated by Mr. Harold Copping. It is a definite attempt to combine scholarship with reverence; it is not a paraphrase (the quotations are from *A.V., R.V.,* and Moffatt, though all these are left on occasion) but it describes

> the mighty pageant of life which moves through the Bible . . . . the pageant of the soul of man in its ascending quest for God.

A volume to give to those repelled by the forbidding format of many editions of the Scriptures.

Dr. John Stewart's answer to the question *When Did Our Lord Actually Live?* (Clark, 4s. 6d.) is "From 8 B.C. to A.D. 24." The revolutionary element in this thesis is not in bringing the Nativity from 4 B.C. to 8 B.C., but in fixing the Crucifixion in A.D.24. Dr. Stewart was first led

to this date by the statement in a Chinese classic of 1701 that the story of Jesus, including His death and resurrection, was brought to China between 25 and 28. 15th Nisan fell on a Thursday in 24 and 33, and an examination of the evidence leads Dr. Stewart to the conclusion that of these the year 24 is to be preferred. We cannot say we found a chronology convincing which puts Paul's conversion in 27, and his first missionary journey in 46.

So far from fixing dates for the life of Jesus, Mr. L. Gordon Rylands believes that Jesus never lived at all. In *Did Jesus Ever Live ?* (Watts, 2s. 6d.) he summarizes the arguments of the W.B. Smith—Robertson—Drews school.

"History, common sense and coincidence", so Mr. H. M. Gillett, the author of *Relics of the Passion* (Blackwell, 4s. 6d.) tells us, all suggest that the survival of relics of the Passion "was both probable and possible." The Cross, the Nails, the Title, the Crown of Thorns, the Lance, the Cloth —these are discussed in turn. Mr. Gillett argues that everything connected with the Crucifixion would be reverently collected and kept, that in many cases relics now treasured are genuine, and that the true Cross was discovered by Helena in 327. His credibility is too amazing for words.

All that Dr. Richard Roberts writes has his mark upon it, and *That Strange Man Upon His Cross* (Allenson, 3s. 6d.) is a fresh and helpful study of the life and death of Jesus. Sometimes we disagree with Dr. Roberts altogether—as in the understanding of the words "It is finished" —but the whole study is full of suggestion, and reveals the writer once again as an expositor out of the ordinary.

In the "Westminster Books" (Hodder, 3s.) with their very attractive format, we have two more volumes, Dr. J. W. Hunkin's *Is It Reasonable to Believe ?* and Dr. James Reid's **Why Be Good ?* Many will be interested in the former because of the author's recent preferment to the see of Truro, and it is revealing to compare his section on the Church with that in Dr. Reid's book. The latter is extraordinarily good value and extremely timely, discussing, as it does, not only the writings of the Huxleys, Walter Lippmann, and J. W. Crutch, but also the practical problems of family and business life. Every minister should buy the book.

The Epworth Press is to be congratulated on the first volumes in the "God and Life" series (3s. 6d.), edited by the Rev. B. A. Barber. They are Dr. J. A. Findlay's *A Portrait of Paul,* Dr. A. W. Harrison's *Liberal Puritanism,* Dr. R. E. Roberts's *The Message of the Parables,* and the Rev. Robert Strong's *Interpreters of Life.*

At the moment we are almost sorry that Mr. Harold Shepheard is a member of our Editorial Board, for to praise a member of one's Editorial Board in public is almost as "not done" as to praise a near relative. Nevertheless, we must take the risks and say, at all costs, that **This Far Country* (Allenson, 2s. 6d.) is a great little book in which insight is allied to a style at once clear and sensitive. It is a book impossible to summarize, for every sentence on its 96 pages counts, but we cannot imagine anyone reading it without feeling a better man, with longings for the Father's house. These brief words and the quotation under "Worth Noting" will, we hope, determine all our readers to get the book.

Canon Anthony C. Deane's *The Valley and Beyond* (Hodder, 3s. 6d.) will be found pleasant and helpful, if rather slight, though there is some puzzling arithmetic on p. 75.

Dr. F. A. M. Spencer's *The Future Life* (Hamilton, 7s. 6d.) is a competent study which all students of the problem will find of great service. It is well written, shows wide knowledge of the works of previous writers (though it is surprising to find no mention of Edward White), and a temper in which the critical and constructive are well-balanced. Dr. Spencer not merely takes account of scriptural conceptions of immortality, but examines Greek speculation, theological interpretations, and psychic communications. He then looks at the doctrines of metempsychosis and evolutionary immortality, and finally shows how the doctrine of eternal life through the Risen Christ and the general conception of evolution can be linked together. The relation of the life of Christ to immortality is thus summarized:

> First, it furnishes empirical evidence of this premise in the character and career of Jesus Christ. Secondly, it affords an actual instance of the premise resulting in the desired conclusion, in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. Thirdly, it offers a practical method by which the love of God may be so received as to bring us to immortality. For Jesus Christ being revealed as a Divine Personality capable of intimate spiritual contact with the multitudes of human individuals, we are invited to ask His help for the overcoming of both sin and death. By virtue of His victory over moral evil on the cross He is prepared to help us to moral victory in ourselves and fitness for eternal life. Is He not also prepared to help us by virtue of His victory over death through His Resurrection to victory over death in ourselves, and thus to attain the immortality which is our heritage as children of the immortal God who is Love?

Miss Phyllis T. Wood's *The Heavenly Vision* (S.C.M., 5s.) is an anthology in three sections, "Vision and Aspiration," "Vision and Adoration," "Vision and Action." Many modern writers are drawn upon—John Oman, W. E. Orchard, C. E. Raven, Tagore, Evelyn Underhill, Herbert Gray, T. W. Manson, T. R. Glover, H. H. Farmer, are among those we noticed. Here is a selection from Augustine:

> When the days are weary and the time is long, a man should turn to God, where no such thing as long exists, and all things are at rest.

A very different kind of anthology is Father Paul de Jaegher's *An Anthology of Mysticism* (Burns, Oates, 7s. 6d.) The selections are drawn mainly from well-known mystics like Ruysbroeck, Suso, Rolle, Tauler, Catherine of Siena, and Teresa, but there are modern representatives in the persons of Lucie Christine and Gemma Galgani.

In *Modern Mystics* (Murray, 10s. 6d.) Sir Francis Younghusband has given us a fresh and forceful treatment of a topic to which he has given much thought. He draws the mystics he describes from different lands and religions—Keshub Chander Sen, Ramakrishna, and Vivekenanda, Hindus; the Bab and his Moslem followers; the Roman Catholic Ste. Thérèse de Lisieux; the Protestant authoress of *The Golden Fountain*; Evan Roberts and the Welsh revivalists. The easy way is to account for all these as pathological cases; Sir Francis wisely goes behind and beneath so facile a solution, and strives to find the basis of mystical experience. He interprets it as

> a vivid expression of the universe as a whole. In his experience the mystic has become aware of the underlying unity of the Spirit which binds together and animates the universe.

In other words, he is "enthralled by God."

In the concluding chapter Sir Francis gives some sound counsel on methods of meditation. There is a misprint on page 82.

Dom Chapman, of Downside, was not merely a Patristic scholar; he was a frequent leader of retreats, and a correspondent of troubled souls.

The Spiritual Letters of Dom John Chapman (Sheed & Ward, 8s. 6d.) are divided into "Letters to Lay Folk," "Letters to Religious," and "Letters to a Jesuit." They deal in the main with the spiritual life, and problems of meditation and devotion, and are introduced by Dom Hudleston, who also writes a Memoir.

Three little aids to devotion follow, all useful. They are the Rev. C. H. S. Matthews's *The Secret Shrine* (Athenæum Press, 2s.)—"Thoughts Suggested by the Lord's Prayer"; the Rev. Wilfrid Harper's *Guide for Private Prayer* (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d. & 2s. 6d.)—"A Scheme for Morning, Noontide, and Evening Devotions"; and Miss Margaret Cropper's *Draw Near* (S.P.C.K., 1s. & 6d.), a book of prayers in the "Manuals of the Inner Life" series.

Even non-philosophers can read Mr. C. E. M. Joad's *Return to Philosophy* (Faber, 7s. 6d.) with pleasure and interest: it throbs with vitality, and shows Mr. Joad in touch with modern men and recent books. This is true, despite Mr. Joad's contention that the book is not topical. It is a defence of philosophy, which is a synthesizer, an antidote to the stresses and fears of to-day, and "a window through which the consciousness of man attains a vision of the world of being." The sub-title, "A Defence of Reason, An Affirmation of Values, and A Plea for Philosophy" accurately summarizes an essay in which Mr. Joad lays about him vigorously, to the delight of his readers and the discomfiture of his opponents.

It is a gratifying feature of our political life that our statesmen have often made contributions to learning. Sir Herbert Samuel's *Practical Ethics* in the "Home University Library" (Butterworth, 2s. 6d.) can only deal summarily with the important topics which come within its province, but he handles them with lucidity and commonsense.

Dr. H. Banister's **Psychology and Health* (Cambridge Press, 7s. 6d.) is one of the sanest books on psychology we have met. Occasionally the author rides his hobbies and we can by no means accept his views, as on hypnosis, but in general his treatment is remarkably well-balanced and pertinent. After expounding the causes of ill-health in childhood and adult life, and discussing hysteria, anxiety-states, obsessions, *etc.*, he summarizes in admirable chapters the theories of Janet, Freud, Jung, and Adler, and then proceeds to discuss treatment, especially by suggestion and analysis. We recommend all those who have communicated with us about the dangers of amateur psychotherapy, concerning which we recently wrote, to study this book.

Miss A. Graham Ikin calls *Religion and Psychotherapy* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.) "A Plea for Co-operation." It is more than that, for while insisting that doctors, ministers, and psychotherapists should work together it discusses very pertinently subjects like suggestion, faith, spiritual healing, and mystical experience. A timely little book.

Dr. W. J. Sparrow Simpson's *Religious Thought in France in the 19th Century* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) gives the impression of notes carelessly thrown together. Indeed, the title itself is careless, for much of the book deals with the 20th century rather than with the 19th—Couchoud, Loisy, Janvier, all belong to this century rather than to last. Nevertheless, the notes are often valuable, especially for English readers, to whom the religion of France is *terra incognita*.

What are the "Churches of Christ"? A concise answer may be found in *Discipleship in the Church* (Berean Press, 1s. 3d. and 6d.) by the Rev. James Gray, Lecturer at Overdale College.

Mrs. Caroline M. Duncan-Jones believes that Bunyan was "a narrow hater of other men's religions" and that under the Clarendon Code the Puritans "suffered less and more justly than the clergy in the Commonwealth." This will be sufficient to indicate the angle from which *The Story of Christendom* (S.P.C.K., 6s.) is written. The book is a marvel of conciseness, covering the story of the Church to the present time in some five hundred pages. It is a pity that for the twentieth century the writer shows herself narrower than Bunyan in the seventeenth.

The Rev. H. E. Worlledge's *This Latter House* (Skeffington, 2s. 6d.) is "an attempt to forecast the future of the Church of England" from the pen of an Anglo-Catholic. It is neither consistent nor convincing: Nonconformity, for example, is dying (p. 124) but failure to sell city churches and go to the suburbs means that "the new districts are settling down to Nonconformity or sheer Paganism!" The attitude to Nonconformists is amusing; they are to be treated as Jesus treated the Samaritans—

> although to them as individuals Christ showed just the same love and kindness as He did to the orthodox Jews, as a religious communion He showed them no sympathy whatever.

Roman Catholics, however, "are fellow-sharers with us of the Catholic heritage." If the reader wants to discover where this kind of teaching leads he should ponder the note on p. 91.

The Revs. Alban Baverstock and Donald Hole, the authors of *The Truth About The Prayer Book* (Williams & Norgate, 3s.) desire "the attainment of Catholic Reunion under the Primacy of the Holy See." They argue that the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552, and 1662 were all imposed on the Church by the State, the first being the work of Cranmer ("England hated Protestantism. She hated Cranmer and his works") and a little Protestant, Zwinglian clique.

> Originated by Cranmer, disliked by the English Church, by the laity and clergy alike, excepting only those who had been thrust into their offices by Protestants in power in order to help on the work of destroying Catholicism, the First English Prayer Book was imposed by the civil government, without anything more than the pretence of ecclesiastical sanction.

What the authors now desire is not only the separation of the Church of England from the State but the use of "the ancient Liturgy of the Western Church, either in Latin or English."

Lord Hugh Cecil's *The Communion Service as It Might Be* (Oxford Press, 2s. 6d.) is a re-arrangement of the Communion Service in the Revised Prayer Book. In the Introduction he explains that the service is based on the belief

> that in the Eucharist the bread and wine by consecration become the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, and that the sacrament so consecrated is offered as a commemorative and representative oblation, showing forth the death of Christ upon the Cross before God and man, and the communicants being joined, with the whole Church, in the mystical Body of Christ, are likewise offered as one sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

Lord Hugh also aims at making the Eucharist one rite, avoiding separation between the Breaking of the Bread and the Communion of the Faithful. He offers this form as a contribution to the preparation of a new and authoritative form which, he believes, is widely desired.

All lovers of parish churches will be grateful to Messrs. Batsford, the publishers of the remarkably cheap *The Parish Churches of England* (7s. 6d.), which now bears the names of Dr. J. C. Cox and Mr. C. B. Ford. To publish a book with 140 fine illustrations at such a price is commendable

indeed. Dr. Cox's *English Parish Churches,* published in 1914, was useful, but it had obvious weaknesses. These have now been remedied, and the volume well deserves the praise Dr. Inge gives it.

The temper in which Mr. Joseph McCabe writes would spoil even a good cause, and he has missed a real chance in *The Social Record of Christianity* (Watts, 1s.). There is so much in the history of the Christian Church that must be deplored that a calm and restrained account of its failures and its cowardice would have been useful, but to ignore the other side and to blame the Church for everything "cuts no ice" at all. Anything less "rational" and less suitable for the "Thinker's Library" we cannot imagine.

Dr. A. G. Mackinnon's *The Rome of the Medieval Church* (Lutterworth Press, 7s. 6d.) is the third volume which he has devoted to the Imperial City. Its title is rather misleading, for while it begins with Athanasius, it ends on the threshold of the 10th century. Dr. Mackinnon's method is to select particular incidents and chat about them in a popular style. There are a dozen good illustrations.

We give a warm welcome to Dr. R. J. Smithson's *The Anabaptists* (Clarke, 5s.), especially as it is an endeavour to give to a long despised people the credit which is their due. Dr. Smithson does not deal with original sources, but he has provided an admirable and handy summary of the history and tenets of the Anabaptists which will be helpful to the general reader and a good starting point for the research student. Some easily accessible matter about the Anabaptists in England seems to have missed Dr. Smithson's notice, and he does not seem to have made up his mind whether the General Baptists are directly connected with the Anabaptists or not. There is, as he does well to point out, some relationship with Baptists, Quakers, and Plymouth Brethren, all of whom are in debt to these persecuted and maligned folk. What is now needed is digging to find how the veins run underground. We hope Dr. Smithson will undertake the task.

The name of Vico invariably brings to mind one of the most stimulating series of lectures we ever heard—by C. E. Vaughan in our salad days. Vaughan was Professor of English Literature, but political philosophy had at least an equal share in his affections, and his vigorous expositions (they formed the basis of *Studies in the History of Political Philosophy* published subsequently) made the 17th and 18th century political philosophers living figures. Rousseau, of course, but perhaps especially Vico and Montesquieu, and we are by no means so certain as Mr. H. P. Adams, whose *Life and Writings of Giambattista Vico* (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.) is before us, that the author of *L'Esprit des Lois* never read the *Scienza Nuova.* Nevertheless we are glad to have Mr. Adams's book, for Vico is an attractive personality about whom too little is known. Mr. Adams is not so mature in his treatment as was Vaughan, but he provides a useful sketch of Vico's life and writings, sufficient to enable the reader to realize that the Neapolitan was an early H. G. Wells, who took the universe for his province, and wrote in provocative fashion about it.

There was room for a biography of Marcus Aurelius, and Dr. F. H. Hayward's *Marcus Aurelius : A Saviour of Men* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) ably fills the gap. The title suggests the weakness of Dr. Hayward's treatment; he is emotional, enthusiastic, and too inclined to superlatives ("Marcus was probably the most compassionate person in history."). It has, of course, the virtues of these defects, and in these days of debunking it is good to find a biographer as wholehearted as Dr. Hayward. The

"chronological list" is specially useful, while in the discussion of Marcus's "suicide" Dr. Hayward is at his best—he leaves the question open, with a strong bias to "semi-suicide." We trust the book will revive interest in the Emperor. Is Dr. Hayward correct in saying that Plutarch's *Lives* "have rarely been used for a century past in any of our educational or religious institutions"?

In *Puritan Salt* (Lutterworth Press, 4s. 6d.) the Rev. George Walker has made a good story of the short life of Richard Madox, a chaplain to Fenton's ill-starred voyage in 1581. Born in Mary's reign, Madox became a Fellow of All Soul's, and left a diary which was used by Hakluyt. His journal and a sermon to mariners are the bones about which Mr. Walker constructs his narrative, in which he skilfully brings out the Puritan love of music, and of adventure. No doubt Mr. Walker has ample grounds for the assumption that "*John* Madoxe" on the title-page of the sermon is an error for Richard, but the evidence might have been given.

D. H. Fleming was one of the many Scots whom Robertson Nicoll brought out. A scholar and anti-Roman controversialist second only to Dr. Coulton, Dr. Fleming gave his life to research into his beloved St. Andrews, the history of his country and of his Church. Mr. H. M. Paton's *David Hay Fleming: Historian and Antiquary* (Oliver & Boyd, 5s.) provides a succinct account of a type of scholar—devout in religion, thorough in investigation, forthright in criticism—now almost extinct. It is greatly to be regretted that Fleming did not give the world that history of John Knox's time he was so well qualified to give.

The Archbishop of York has written the Epilogue to Mr. Albert Mansbridge's *Edward Stuart Talbot and Charles Gore* (Dent, 3s. 6d.), sympathetic sketches of two of the most striking personalities of the Anglicanism of yesterday. Special mention must be made of the illustrations.

Robert Somervell, cousin of W. H. Somervell, for long Treasurer of the London Missionary Society, was largely instrumental, in the fifteen years which intervened between school life and Cambridge, in laying the foundation of the Kendal business of which the "K" shoe is the best-known product. With a background of narrow evangelicalism associated with the Plymouth Brethren and the Friends and Congregationalism, Robert Somervell found himself, after a first at Cambridge and a spell of teaching in Liverpool, as Master and Bursar of Harrow under Welldon and his successors. In *Robert Somervell* (Faber, 5s.), his two sons, the Solicitor-General and Mr. D. C. Somervell, have edited memoirs which their father prepared. The tablet in the School Chapel at Harrow bears the well-merited tribute:

> A man of rare modesty and deep religion, wise in counsel and wide in sympathy, he inspired the strong and encouraged the weak, and was loved and honoured by all who knew him.

Ever since we heard Bishop Welldon, then Dean of Manchester, speak with simple directness about industrial life in St. Mary's one Sunday evening, we have held him in great respect: so many 8.30 preachers seemed to think a visit to Oxford was an occasion to show off learning—except the Bishop of London, who generally told us that he had made his address while shaving. Now, in *Forty Years On* (Nicholson & Watson, 15s.) we have the Bishop's reflections, and very interesting they are. Head Master of Harrow, a Bishop abroad, Dean of Manchester and Durham, Bishop Welldon has had a full and varied life, and his ruminations deserve study. They have a decided pre-War tone, and there is an amount of repetition

which makes us suspect the chapters were written at different times, but their combination of shrewdness and ripeness is not too common. The writer has found humility and gratitude to be the two rarest of human virtues; he notes that the three new beneficent societies which have spread over the world—the Y.M.C.A., the Salvation Army, and the Boy Scouts—all originated in Britain. He considers a national Church an advantage, and he is apprehensive about the Far East. His words about the place of celibacy in the Church are worth pondering, but the categorical statement, "Our Lord's purpose in His ministry upon earth was to found a Church" will not meet with universal agreement. This brief summary merely indicates some of the many points touched upon in a volume which covers a wide range. Bishop Welldon, by the way, has just published *Characters of the Passion* (Skeffington, 3s. 6d.), which, after chapters on the Jews, Judas, Pilate, and Jesus, contains addresses on the Words from the Cross.

No book of the last few months have we read with greater pleasure than Mr. Lyman Beecher Stowe's *Saints, Sinners and Beechers* (Nicholson & Watson, 12s. 6d.). Lyman Beecher, a seven-months' child, whose mother survived only two days, almost died at birth; he lived to be 87, to have thirteen children, being, in Theodore Parker's words "the father of more brains than any other man in America." This readable book tells of his life and work, and of those of his remarkable children, of whom Harriet Beecher Stowe and Henry Ward Beecher were only a little more gifted and famous than the rest of their brothers and sisters. With any amount of energy, and utterly refusing to be bound by convention, the Beechers threw themselves not only into their own business, but into everybody else's. Their genius was not without a touch of eccentricity which sometimes crossed the border-line, and often they showed themselves lacking in commonsense. But father and children made no small contribution to American life and thought, and it is well that a member of the family has given to the world this informing narrative.

Dr. G. G. Coulton's *H. W. Fowler* (Oxford Press, 3s. 6d.)—S.P.E. Tract XLIII—an account of the shy schoolmaster who became a soldier at 57 and one of the greatest authorities on the English language—is as admirable as it is concise. A phrase of Fowler's, all the more remarkable as coming from a schoolmaster, should be noted by all pseudo-psycho-analysts—"a certain reluctance to meddle with the insides of other people's minds unless it is a clear duty to do it."

We have long been praying that Mr. J. Middleton Murry should be able to laugh at himself—he is worse than John Shand in this respect—and pleading with him to cease the interminable process of self-analysis with which he has become obsessed. *Between Two Worlds* (Cape, 10s. 6d.), an autobiography which brings down his life-story to within a short time of Katherine Mansfield's death, makes us long for the day when his energies will be directed to something objective, when what he himself calls his "morbid emphasis upon the personal" will have no scope. On another page Mr. Murry speaks about his "reticence." That quality is not evident in this volume, which is marked by an unhappy exhibitionism; it is as embarrassing to read about a man's sexual adventures as about his outbursts of weeping. Mr. Murry can *write*: of that there is no doubt; let him write a life of Lenin, or research into the history of Communism, and forget himself—and D. H. Lawrence as well!

About Lawrence there is still another book—his wife's *Not I, But The Wind . . . .* (Heinemann, 10s. 6d.). We hope it may be the last, and that Lawrence's writings will be allowed to find their own level: we are

prepared to repeat the prophecy of some years ago that in a generation they will have sunk out of sight of all but the "researcher." Mrs. Lawrence tells of her own life with Lawrence—with all its conflict and strain; in the many letters from him she quotes lies the volume's chief merit.

The Rev. Basil Martin has called his brief autobiography *An Impossible Parson* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.). For many years a Congregational minister, and for the last twenty years minister of a Unitarian Church, Mr. Martin has been rather a stormy petrel, and now he writes to expose the weaknesses of institutional religion. About several Congregational Colleges he has striking things to relate, as about Congregational scholars—Fairbairn, Forsyth, Horton—and about the "New Theology." A pacifist and a fighter (how often the two go together!) Mr. Martin is naturally concerned about the Church's failure in regard to war. Perhaps the most interesting part of the story is the account of life in Hereford, especially when Percival was its Bishop.

The Letters of Queen Victoria and Mr. Guedalla's recently published *The Queen and Mr. Gladstone* are the main materials which Mr. E. F. Benson has used in his readable and human *Queen Victoria* (Longmans, 16s.). All the books written about the Queen since Mr. Lytton Strachey have not been able to avoid the note of irony, and Mr. Benson's is no exception, though he ends with a panegyric of Victoria as mother of her people. He pays tribute to her commonsense, her devotion to duty, her insight, her marvellous recuperative power. Monarchs who are women in every way have the best of it, for even historians must be chivalrous and loyal; a Queen's obstinacy is strength of character, her love of her own way regal dignity, and so on. Nothing can excuse Victoria's treatment of Gladstone, as Mr. Benson recognizes, and we cannot imagine our Georgian politicians having the patience of Gladstone and his Cabinets. There is not much that is new in Mr. Benson's narrative, but it is an able study of a long and full reign, and of a very ordinary personality remarkable only because of her position and her longevity.

If they are not too technical we invariably enjoy books by medical men, and Sir Arthur Newsholme's *Fifty Years in Public Health* (Allen & Unwin, 15s.) is full of interest, with its almost unique amalgam of private and public life. The opening pages, which describe Sir Arthur's early days in Haworth and relate stories of the Brontës, pave the way to a story of training, general practice, and subsequent administration. The book shows the great progress made in half a century, and is almost a history of the movement for public health in which the writer has played so distinguished a part. A misprint on p. 376 is a tiny blemish in an informing book which should prove invaluable for reference.

Mr. George G. Harrap's *Some Memories, 1901-1935* (Harrap, 3s. 6d.) is the story of the house of Harrap, told by its veteran head, the record of how "a little one became a thousand."

Dr. E. Lee Howard, the author of *My Adventure into Spiritualism* (Macmillan, 8s. 6d.) is an American Congregational minister, and not the least interesting of his pages are those which describe spirit-messages from Ozora S. Davis and W. E. Barton, both of whom were Moderators of the Congregational Churches. Dr. Howard has been convinced of the existence of discarnate spirits and of spirit possession, and he quotes many striking experiences. We do not think, however, that his book will be found convincing; some, at any rate, of the phenomena he describes can be explained in ways other than those Dr. Howard selects.

Another book dealing with this subject is Mr. C. T. Campion's *From*

Christianity to Spiritualism (Allen & Unwin, 4s. 6d.). Mr. Campion finds a link between Christianity and Spiritualism in the writings of Dr. Schweitzer, which he expounds. We must confess we are too dense to follow his argument.

Dr. H. W. Bayly, the author of *Triple Challenge* (Hutchinson, 18s.) is described as "an absolutely fearless protagonist." In these memoirs of the years 1914 to 1929 he shows the description to be not undeserved, though the number of causes in which he has felt "it his duty to take a certain line" has been legion. His general attitude to life may be gathered from the fact that he was an Ulster volunteer, an advocate of "True Temperance Reform" who denounced "the ridiculous pharasaical [*sic*] and foolish cult of Puritan," a healer of men who found war "a glorious experience and a noble inspiration, *not* a foul debauch" and now deplores the fact that "Pacifist propaganda pollutes Press and platform." Most of Dr. Bayly's superiors in Army or Navy or politics or medicine seem to have been unutterably stupid, and not least so in the failure to recognize the Solomon in their midst! The most useful parts of Dr. Bayly's book are those in which he quotes from records kept on land and sea during the War.

Dr. H. S. Canby, Editor of the American *Saturday Review of Literature,* calls the nineties *The Age of Confidence* (Constable, 7s. 6d.) as opposed to our present "age of mobility." Brought up in an Episcopalian household with a Quaker background, Dr. Canby seems to have sat loosely to religious organizations all his life. People in the nineties "went to church because they were afraid"; it was an age when religion declined

> from faith and even passion to conformity, from conformity to indifference, from indifference to a habit backed by an instinctive fear of chance.

"Something had dropped out between education and reality"; there was no contact between knowledge given and life. Though "equally knowing in sex" with young moderns, the youth of the nineties were not sex-conscious, and there was "a healthy tranquillity" about the freedom between boys and girls which Dr. Canby thinks the best state for youth. He has given us a picture of the life of a New England town which should be read with Miss M. E. Chase's *A Goodly Heritage*.

My Seven Selves (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.) describes the 49 years Mr. Hamilton Fyfe has lived since he was 14. Very full years they are, with life at *The Times,* the *Daily Mail,* and the *Daily Herald* interspersed with spells as free lance. The new and the old journalism are seen in contrast as Mr. Fyfe surveys the history in which he has had no small part; Northcliffe is but the most outstanding of the many notable figures who appear in these pages. Life as special correspondent during the War is followed by experience as Labour editor, a revealing picture of the difficulty of managing a paper by Trades Unions. Mr. Ramsay MacDonald is made to cut an unpleasant figure; indeed, none of the Labour leaders seem to have won Mr. Fyfe's affection as did Northcliffe.

Of the author himself it is not easy to form an opinion from this book. We get the general impression of a man who might have done much with his life had it been integrated; the lack of religious faith is significant, and is no doubt responsible for the absence of any dominating purpose, and maybe of lapses from taste of which there are several instances.

Mr. C. F. Andrews's *John White of Mashonaland* (Hodder, 5s.) is the biography of a devoted Methodist missionary who gave his life to Africa and its people. He did a pioneer's work with great heroism, and afterwards defended the rights of the Africans with such vigour that he drew

upon himself not only the hatred of many white men in Africa, but the disapproval of many of his fellow-missionaries. As he witnessed for God in the days of his strength, so he did in weakness, and not the least powerful of Mr. Andrews's pages are those in which he tells of the long months at Kingsmead when his friend lay fighting against cancer.

It is a pity that Mr. Andrews's *The Indian Earthquake* (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d.) could not have been issued a year ago. Human memories are very short, and even Mr. Andrews's appealing picture of the appalling suffering caused by the Bihar earthquake will, we fear, win little practical help to-day. Mr. Andrews describes the scene, outlines what has been done to help, and emphasizes the part played by Mahatma Gandhi, who was rebuked by Tagore for finding in the earthquake God's chastisement for untouchability.

It was hoped that one of the results of the Royal Jubilee would be an increase in trade. Judging from the number of books issued the publishing trade must have benefited. Mr. John Drinkwater's *Twenty-five Years a King* (Methuen, 5s.) is "A Commentary in Prose and Picture," and is based on the Movietone News Theatre film prepared for the King's 68th birthday. Sir John Marriott's *Twenty-Five Years of the Reign of King George V* (Methuen, 2s. 6d.) is a crowded summary of less than 100 pages. It is no easy task to write about royalty, but *Our Three Great Queens* (Indep. Press, 3s. 6d.) proves that Mr. David Williamson is fully equal to it. Victoria, Alexandra, and Queen Mary—these three strikingly different personalities have occupied their high place during the last hundred years. Mr. Williamson tells of their lives, with many anecdotes and happy touches.

Mr. D. C. Somervell has scored another bull's eye with his *The Reign of King George V* (Faber, 12s. 6d.), a political history of the last twenty-five years. Only occasionally do we feel that Mr. Somervell's own views colour the narrative—has Mr. Walter Elliot been as successful at the Ministry of Agriculture as is suggested, and does Willie Graham deserve the reference to him on p. 451? Generally, however, the book is written, and pleasantly written, with scientific detachment; we know of no other place where a similar treatment is obtainable within 500 pages.

Mr. Frank Swinnerton's *The Georgian Literary Scene* (Heinemann, 12s. 6d.) is a long book, but we have enjoyed every page of it—or nearly every page, for an absurd obsession about Cambridge is annoying, and an utter misrepresentation of Yorkshiremen quite ridiculous—oh, yes! there is, too, the section on D. H. Lawrence, which reiterates time after time that he is a genius while proving just the opposite! On the whole, however, we find ourselves generally approving Mr. Swinnerton's verdicts, which undoubtedly proves that our view is pre- rather than post-war, for we imagine that it will be generally felt that Mr. Swinnerton speaks with greater authority and sympathy about the Wells, Shaw, Galsworthy, Bennett, Barrie, Belloc, Chesterton contingent than about, say, Aldous Huxley and Richard Aldington.

The book gains in value through the author's personal acquaintance with many of the writers of the Georgian age. It is a timely and useful conspectus.

The latest of the plays of Aeschylus to be translated into rhyming verse by Prof. Gilbert Murray is *The Seven Against Thebes* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. and 2s.). Once again the Introduction and the Notes leave nothing to be desired. Prof. Murray places many who have no Greek, as well as his own students, greatly in his debt.

Charles Lamb continues to attract writers, even though they admit that Mr. E. V. Lucas has said the last word about his life. An American Professor, Miss E. C. Johnson, of Wellesley, has managed to work out a thesis very skilfully in *Lamb Always Elia* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.), a very apt title for a workmanlike volume, in which the bibliography and index are sufficient in themselves to guarantee the writer's competence. The book makes its point in a manner worthy of Elia himself, showing that Lamb was always the essayist, and that the essays can be found in embryo in letters, *etc.*

All those who write will learn from Dr. P. B. Ballard's *Thought and Language* (London University Press, 6s.), a lively volume in which one who has obviously been a schoolmaster writes of words and sentences, of language and style. The chapters which deal with simplicity, pedantry, style, and punctuation are perhaps the best in the book, though those on "Poetry" and "The Modernists' are very enjoyable.

Mr. Gerald Bullett, the Editor of the "How and Why" series (Black, 2s. 6d.) has himself written *The Story of English Literature*. He recognizes that in a survey occupying less than 100 pages the sections—like that, say, on Shakespeare—must be "absurdly brief," but it has to be admitted that he succeeds in his aim and gives the beginner an appetite for more.

The reader will pass a pleasant hour with *Sheppard's Pie* (Cassell, 6s. & 3s. 6d.). Dr. H. R. L. Sheppard, the *chef,* has selected the ingredients to his own taste. Familiar and unfamiliar, together they are very palatable.

There is always a fascination about origins, and many literary aspirants will greatly enjoy *Beginnings* (Nelson, 5s.), in which Adrian Alington, L. E. O. Charlton, A. E. Coppard, A. J. Cronin, E. M. Delafield, Louis Golding, Wyndham Lewis, V. S. Pritchett, V. Sackville-West, Beatrice Kean Seymour, Helen Simpson, L. A. G. Strong, Alec Waugh, and Malachi Whitaker tell how they began to write. They describe early struggles in various ways, but after all they are all comparative successes: their accounts should be balanced by those of a dozen failures.

As we read the papers in *Damnable Opinions* (Watts, 3s. 6d.) we could not but feel that their writer, Mr. Llewelyn Powys, was a pathetic figure. Anything more irrational than the diatribes of this "rationalist" about religion it would be difficult to imagine. Mr. Powys believes "that the sensual content of every living being is the only reasonable purpose of life," that "the true purpose of life is personal happiness," and that immortality is a self-interested fancy based on "an irrepressible and irresponsible egotism." A Broadcast Service from Westminster heard in a country garden has "something craven, unhealthy, neurotic about it" and is "an affront to the confidence of nature."

One of the papers—that on Cardinal Newman—is reprinted from the *Congregational Quarterly,* which finds itself in very strange company.

Miss Joyce Reason's *Our Fathers in the Faith* (Ind. Press, 2s. 6d.) reprinted from the *Christian World,* puts the history of the Christian Church —as far as the Huguenots—in conversational form.

Dr. H. W. Clark appears in a new *rôle* in *A Short History of the British Empire* (Muller, 7s. 6d.), and very successfully, for he has performed the almost impossible task of making an outline readable. Conspicuous, too, among the merits of the book are the sufficiency of dates and the exhaustive Index. The book is written largely, though not only, for schools, and these features are therefore specially valuable. Occasionally, in compression, Dr. Clark perhaps assumes too much knowledge

in his readers: "Mr. Gandhi," for example, suddenly appears on p. 187 without any indication as to who he is.

Three books on Communism follow. Mr. Ralph Fox's *Communism* (Lane, 3s. 6d.) is the work of an avowed Communist. It contains much that is true in its indictment of the present economic system, but its argument is vitiated by the extravagance of some of its statements. Capitalism is "rooted in violence, exists by violence, and can only be destroyed by violence," while in England in 1934

> poverty of the most desperate, terrible kind spreads everywhere, and the newspapers of the most "civilised" country in the world are filled with a bitter dispute as to whether 3000 or 3400 calories are sufficient to maintain an unemployed man.

And the manifest inaccuracy of others:

> The General Strike of 1926 showed perfectly clearly that before a *united working class* the number of persons upon whom capitalism can rely, outside its own armed forces, is ridiculously small.

Mr. G. M. Godden's *The Communist Attack on Great Britain* (Burns, Oates, 1s. 6d.) is a handbook which describes in detail, quoting chapter and verse, the organization of the Communist movement in this country, with its activities in the way of penetration, literature, and propaganda (especially anti-religious). Quoting a Russian Communist, "Immorality in the schools is making satisfactory progress," it urges that Britain's defence should be mobilized, that the Board of Education should refuse to employ avowed Communists.

The third book is *Christ and Communism* (Hodder, 5s.) by Dr. E. Stanley Jones, the author of *The Christ of the Indian Road*. Dr. Jones has felt the challenge of communism, both in theory and in seeing it at work in Russia; in India he heard a voice speaking over the radio from Moscow, asking, "Why is there no unemployment in the U.S.S.R.?" and "Is there individual liberty in the Soviet system?", and this book is the result of the disturbance in his own mind. He feels we are wrong to expect world unity while our economic life is based on competition; and that the choice before mankind is between "a materialistic, atheistic Communism and the Kingdom of God on earth." Dr. Jones has been greatly impressed by what he has seen in Russia. The Five Years Plan he believes to have succeeded, and by 1937 he thinks the standard of living will have so improved as to put Russia ahead of other countries in material wellbeing. That fact will challenge the masses throughout the world, and the race between Christianity and Communism now going on in India, China, and elsewhere will be intensified. While recognizing Communism's great achievements in Russia, Dr. Jones shows where the Kingdom of God as expounded by Jesus is wider and better still: it only needs Christians who will serve it with the passion with which Communists serve their religion.

Canon H. R. L. Sheppard, Mr. James Maxton, and Mr. Vernon Bartlett are the latest to tell us what they would do *If I Were Dictator* (Methuen, 2s. 6d. each). Their sketches follow the lines we might expect, though Mr. Maxton's facile way of dealing with currency is amusing. "Dick" Sheppard is concerned only with the Church, and his essay may be considered an addendum to *The Impatience of a Parson*: we like his plea for courageous action and welcome his onslaught on the Church's timidity and timeserving. Mr. Bartlett's contribution is couched in the form of the last words of a dictator who has tried to lead, to make the people think as well as obey. His sketch is perhaps the most practical of all, and is well worth study. His dictator's aim is based on the words:

> The basic conception back of democracy is the conception that all men are free, but that no man is free to injure other men. And it is the function of government to enforce the limitation as well as to guarantee the right.

It is the healthy tone of the other two books which appeals rather than the particular proposals they make.

Mr. Lothrop Stoddard's *Clashing Tides of Colour* (Scribners, 10s. 6d.), a survey of the world which "interprets current conditions and suggests methods of action," is disquieting indeed, even when we allow for the writer's style. He sees on all sides a

> simultaneous process of synthesis and disintegration. The contemporary world is being mastered, yet is becoming masterless. The new master is Western machine civilization.

Disintegration is proceeding alike in the East and the West.

> If the West has almost lost its former sense of solidarity, the East is being literally Balkanized by the impact of Western civilization and by novel ideas such as Nationalism and Communism.

"The shattered comity of Europe is a disaster of incredible magnitude," for it was "the greatest and most enduring constant of all human history." Mr. Stoddard shows how Russia is taking over

> the purely material aspects of our mechanistic civilization while rejecting the cultural and spiritual basis from which it has sprung,

examines Communism and Fascism and the attempts to form a Pan-Europe, looks at America's aloofness, at disrupting Latin America, and at France's reliance on a black army. This section of the book, called "The Lost Comity of the West," is easily the best, though there is much that is searching in the study of China, Japan, India, and Islam in Part II, "The Balkanization of Asia." Part III, on "Africa in Solution," is short and inadequate, and unworthy of the rest of the book.

All students of politics and religion will be well advised to read this volume. Though many of them will not share Mr. Stoddard's view that "enlightened realism" is the solution of the world's problems, they will be indebted to him for an ample supply of data to help them to form conclusions of their own.

Mr. Vash Young returns to the charge in *Getting Along in Life* (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d.) in which he expounds the virtues of being a "Go-Giver." He believes that honesty is the best policy, that service pays, that cheerfulness, industry, and efficiency invariably win through—and from his business experience he produces manifold illustrations to prove his contentions.

Mr. O. A. MacIver's **What Can I Do?* (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d.) is "A Guide to Social Service," and it lives up to its name. Of its three sections, "What Can I Do?", "How Can I Do It?", and "Where Can I Do It?", the last, with its lists of organizations and the kind of work they do, is most serviceable. The writer knows the problem, and his picture gallery of rogues has some fine specimens.

There is no Christian scholar in Britain to-day who has more influence with thinking youth than Professor C. E. Raven, and it is to Christian youth that his Halley Stewart Lecture, *Is War Obsolete?* (Allen & Unwin, 4s. 6d.), is particularly addressed. The discussion of the question leads into deep waters—the conflict of loyalties, the problem of guidance, the Christian and the State, the Christian and the use of force, the Christian and the alternative to war—all treated with a fervour which springs from a sense of urgency and the extreme importance of the subject. Canon Raven writes as one who shared in the horrors and the fellowships of war, and

he has felt that neither with the pacifists nor with the militarists could he be content. He now urges that the Church of Christ is the real "Peace Army," whose business it should be to strive for world unification while acquiescing in the internationalization of armed force. To its younger men and women he appeals to give their lives to the service of reconciliation. If the world is to be saved, armed force must somehow be superseded.

> Surely there are among us men and women sufficiently adventurous, sufficiently Christian, to take up the ministry of reconciliation, to exercise it wherever the outlook is most dangerous and to convince the world that the power of the Spirit is stronger than the arms of the flesh and that in these days warfare is as obsolete and as intolerable as slavery.

Those who marvel that a great international institution like the Roman Catholic Church does not take the lead in the peace movement will do well to read Father H. Gigon's *Ethics of Peace and War* (Burns, Oates, 2s.). Dr. Gigon is out to oppose pacifism, especially as expressed in Father Stratmann's *The Church and War* (1928). To him "the Right of War is the use of Force in the service of Justice." Passive resistance,

> permissible in a case of physical evil, can never be justifiable when it is a question of moral evil . . . . If pacifists put the principle of passive resistance into practice unconditionally they would be guilty of grave morality.

Dr. Gigon quotes abundantly from St. Thomas Aquinas in support of his contentions.

Anthology of Armageddon (Archer, 8s. 6d.) is an excellent idea admirably executed by Mr. Bernard Newman and Mr. I. O. Evans, although misprints like "T. E. Laurence" prevent it from getting full marks. Extracts from some 150 books about the Great War are arranged in approximately chronological order, with great effect. Donald Hankey and Ian Hay, Winston Churchill and H. G. Wells, Barbusse and Remarque, all help to make a volume which Miss Vera Brittain may well include in her son's reading when he wants to join the O.T.C.

Miss Hebe Spaull's *World Problems of To-day explained for Boys and Girls* (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.) deals with such subjects as nationalism, fascism, communism, race prejudice, production and distribution, disarmament.

Canon W. L. Grane's *War : Its Curse and Cure* (Allen & Unwin, 4s. 6d.) is a moving book. It describes the condition of Europe before the War, the consequences of Versailles in fear, lack of trust and security, excessive nationalism, and armaments. It criticizes America's "aloofness," pictures War as it will be, outlines the futile attempts at its mitigation, and presents the alternative facing the nations as "world suicide or the abolition of war."

Dr. Lilly Heber's *Krishnamurti and the World Crisis* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) is really an exposition of the teaching of Krishnamurti, and should be read with *Krishnamurti : The Man and His Message,* published a year or two ago. Dr. Heber sees no spots on the sun ; Krishnamurti is a great teacher and a great healer, and the acceptance of his views would bring the world out of chaos to peace and harmony. The account of Krishnamurti's teaching is largely based on answers he has given to questions put to him at the annual camp at Ommen. Asked if he had any difficulties, he answered :

> I have no difficulties. I do not regard life as a problem. There is no such thing as a problem to the man who truly understands. Problems arise through lack of understanding. When once you understand, that under-

standing abides in your heart. You act in rhythm with life, not in opposition to life, not in disharmony. . . . When you are in love with reality, with life itself, all problems cease.

Dr. Marie C. Stopes's *Marriage in My Time* (Rich & Cowan, 6s.) follows familiar lines in its advocacy of the control of conception, the rights of married women (in regard to employment, taxation, use of maiden name, and the like), and divorce. The most important part of the book is that which suggests a new form of marriage. After the betrothal phase, which should be short, legal marriage should take place, but this should be non-domestic, the two parties following their own business and having no home, but spending their week-ends and holidays together, contraceptives of course being used, then after a long or short period during which the two have saved money for a home, comes domestic marriage. This proposal differs from Judge Lindsey's "companionate marriage" in that the "non-domestic" marriage is not intended to be temporary, but part of a permanent marriage.

The Frustration of Science (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.) contains an interesting set of essays edited by Prof. F. Soddy. The longest is Mr. J. D. Bernal's "Science and Industry," the most informing Sir Daniel Hall's "Science and Agriculture," the most outspoken Prof. V. H. Mottram's "Medicine," with its frank admission of the low standard of the general practitioner and of the folly of medical fashions! Other articles are "Aviation," "The Invention of Sterility," "Bacterial Warfare," and "The Frustration of Science."

Volume VII of the Library Association's excellent "manuals" is *A Manual of Library Organization* (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.) by Mr. B. M. Headicar, the Librarian of the London School of Economics. All who have anything to do with Library administration should study this book, which is the fruit of long experience; it should be compulsory reading for all members of municipal library committees. There will be animated discussion of Mr. Headicar's suggestion that no novel should be bought until six months after publication.

Dreams are always a fascinating study, and we are glad that William Archer had kept the records of his dreams in such fashion that Mr. Theodore Besterman has been able to give us *On Dreams* (Methuen, 7s. 6d.). Archer, while he frequently pokes fun at Freud, is concerned not so much to refute him as to deny the universality of the application of his theories, especially that of wish-fulfilment. The volume has some repetition, but students will find much to interest them both in the discussion of dreams and in the selection from Archer's dreams over ten years.

Fifteen young people under 25 contribute to the symposium *Growing Opinions* (Methuen, 6s.) which Mr. A. C. Johnson has edited. There is nothing peculiarly "youthful" about some of the articles, and others are of no particular interest. Miss Angela Milne's "The Family" is well done, and Mr. Johnson's "The Problem of Peace and War" and Mr. Frank Hardie's "Youth and Politics" are revealing and valuable. The former's indictment of the League of Nations Union for its lack of leadership and of expert publicity, and the latter's exposition of youthful politics, *ex parte* though it be, are both decidedly encouraging. Is it true, we wonder, that the disillusioned war generation of youth was succeeded by idealists and is to be followed by those now at school who are cynical and uninterested because they believe war to be inevitable?

Seven well-known missionaries contribute to *The Modern Missionary* (S.C.M., 1s. 6d.), which is edited by Dr. J. H. Oldham. It is good

to find in these pages due recognition of the fact that present-day conditions make new demands on those who would win the world for Christ.

In the long annals of the L.M.S. not even the story of Livingstone is more stirring than that of those who did their Father's business in great waters, and especially in the South Seas: Williams and Chalmers are but the most heroic of a noble band. The story of this enterprise is told by the Rev. Cecil Northcott in *Southward Ho !* (Livingstone Press, 1s.). It would, we think, be more effective without the personal sections at the beginning and the end: let us have Williams dying on the beach rather than the author walking on it!

Miss K. M. Penzer's *The Scripture Lesson in the Infant School and Kindergarten* (S.C.M., 2s.) is excellent. All Primary and Beginners' Leaders should see it, just as every school should see that it has a copy of Mr. E. H. Hayes's *The Superintendent's Handbook* (N.S.S.U., 1s.), No. 1 of a new series of Sunday School Manuals. For the Lower and Middle Forms of Secondary Schools we have the Rev. H. J. Cartwright's *The Bible in the Class Room* (S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.), which we should rather label "For Middle and Upper Forms."

Mr. W. M. Ryburn has had experience of teaching in India, and his *The Theory and Practice of Christian Education* (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.) has special reference to India and the East, but all engaged in teaching, whether in pulpit or classroom, could learn much from it. On subjects like the children's sermon, group discussion, and dramatics he has much that is useful to say, and it is encouraging to see his emphasis on the need for a "child-centred and youth-centred Church."

Happy indeed must the children be who attend the country school described in Mr. A. A. Matthews's *Education for Life* (Nelson, 2s. 6d.). It is a Church of England Elementary School, and 90 per cent of the children live so far away that they stay for a midday meal. How jolly they are may be seen from the illustrations, which show them engaged with rabbits and calves, lambs and pigs, bees and poultry. Clubs for these and other purposes were organized, and it is worth noting that during the last five years stock worth £350 has been raised, of which £90 has been profit distributed. Mr. Matthews gives detailed information about all the enterprises in which the children shared. He seems to have the co-operation of the parents, and no opposition on the score of competing with local farmers, *etc.* There is no doubt that the success of the experiment owes much to Mr. Matthews himself, and he communicates his enthusiasm to his readers.

To the books on the new Methodist hymn-book already noticed must be added a fine compilation by Mr. J. T. Lightwood, *The Music of the Methodist Hymn-Book* (Epworth Press, 6s.), in which he tells the story of each tune and gives a biographical sketch of its composer.

Twixt Aldgate Pump and Poplar (Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.), the work of "H.M.," the Methodist journalist, is the account of the fifty years' work of the East London Mission, with Peter Thompson and F. W. Chudleigh as its outstanding personalities.

Mr. Bernard Martin's *Over My Shoulder* (Nicholson & Watson, 10s. 6d.) is a pleasant travel book by an English business man. Accompanied by a camera which has provided many admirable pictures for his book, Mr. Martin's trip took him to Ceylon, Australia, New Zealand, Java, British Malaya, Siam, Burma, China, and Japan, across the Pacific, Canada, and the Atlantic home. There is a certain *naiveté* about the narrative which is attractive. The sections on China and Japan, some of which have been broadcast, are the best parts of the book.

The trouble about Mr. S. A. Clark's £10 series (Nicholson & Watson, 5s.) is that it makes one want to be off to the different countries to see if a fortnight can really be spent there on £10. Mr. Clark is both racy and practical, and many English people will find the volumes on *Belgium* and *Scotland* just what they need. The volume on *Spain,* too, is very enjoyable reading, and strikes us as being extremely serviceable. Most readers of these pages will be most interested of all in *England on £10,* for Mr. Clark is an American and it is good to see ourselves as others see us. Here, too, we can better check his estimates of expenditure and argue whether £10 would really spin out. Natives as well as visitors from abroad can learn much from these pages. There are some forgivable mistakes, such as St. John for St. John's College, but the repeated abuse of Cromwell is another matter: English publishers might have prevented him from talking of Oliver's "inexcusable destructiveness to all that was most beautiful in England."

The praise we gave Miss Mary Borden's *Mary of Nazareth* can be given with equal freedom to its successor, *The King of the Jews* (Heinemann, 7s. 6d.). Miss Borden writes with great power and restraint and at no time do we feel any sense of irreverence or regret at reading her reconstruction of the days succeeding the resurrection. Emmaus surely is wrong on p. 79, and it is a pity that a sentence like "they drank the milk she put before them thirstily" disfigures the very powerful chapter VII. The book should be widely read and can do nothing but good.

Miss Nell Hanson has intimate knowledge of Presbyterian Church life, and her *Winds of Pity* (Murray, 7s. 6d.) shows great promise, for she has the power of telling a story. We are sorry, however, that she has made the central figure an English Elmer Gantry, a talented young minister—a "careerist"—whose sexual irregularities result in a trial before the Presbytery and subsequent deposition. Sexual and religious emotion are often related, but it would be deplorable if people were to conclude that Miss Hanson's book remotely resembles the facts. When that has been said, it can be recognized that the story is not without its warning to ministers—lest they look on their calling as "an artist's job," or fail to handle souls seriously. And how true it is that

> the ordinary man knows how to put up a good bluff—and usually does—to his minister.

Mr. Philip Lindsay, too, can tell a story, and his *The Little Wench* (Nicholson & Watson, 7s. 6d.) makes the Knights of the Round Table live again. The "little wench" is Guinevere, and Mr. Lindsay, holding that the women of the Court had nothing to occupy their minds but sex, finds here his excuse for re-telling the story in a vein to suit our sex-obsessed days.

What Mr. Lindsay has done for Arthur and his court, Mr. W. G. Hardy has done for Abraham, and even more skilfully. *Father Abraham* (Dickson, 8s. 6d.) is a novel which holds the reader from first to last, though he must not expect too close an adherence to the Biblical narrative. If this is Mr. Hardy's first novel it is indeed full of promise.

Herr Jacob Wassermann's *Joseph Kerkhoven's Third Existence* (Allen & Unwin, 10s.) is the third volume of a trilogy, but it has 640 pages, and even then it does not end. It was Herr Wassermann's intention to write a fourth volume, but that was not to be. His wonderful powers of insight into the human mind and character are nowhere more evident than in this last work. It is to be regretted that we have lost them so soon. All who are interested in psycho-analysis and psychotherapy would do well to read all that Herr Wassermann has written.

It is just as well that Mrs. Naomi Mitchison tells us that *We Have Been Warned* (Constable, 8s. 6d.) is a novel. Otherwise, despite the multitude of characters with which we are overwhelmed in the opening chapters, it might have been taken for propaganda—in the cause of Bolshevism, sexual freedom, contraceptives, and what not. Tom, the Oxford Don, and his wife Dione, are not without attraction, though they have the inconsistent jerkiness of puppets : the Dione of some chapters would scarcely have been a prey either to Celtic imaginings or the lust of Idris Pritchard. Mrs. Mitchison seems to have an unpleasant mind : she takes her readers to see a legalized abortion in Russia, and misses no opportunity to discuss and describe sexual relationships. Of the five main characters Tom, with his wife's concurrence, has a fortnight's "honeymoon" with a Russian girl with whom he falls in love; Dione is prepared to give herself to the son of her mother's gardener, a young Communist, in order to release his repressions, and she simply asks for trouble in going with Pritchard, and gets it; her sister, a married woman with children, has two lovers; her brother has a child by a working girl who has to "supplement" her earnings; the young Communist, awakened by Dione, has his own "experience" in Russia. All this gives a mild impression of the book, which makes us ask whether a University is a legal entity which can take action for slander : but perhaps Oxford Dons do advise undergraduates to have pre-marital intercourse, and . . . but we forbear. What the living Dons and others who are mentioned will have to say remains to be seen.

We have tried to fathom the motive of the writer of this book, and can only charitably conclude that she believes that marriage, with its "keep only unto him as long as you both shall live" is the cardinal error of civilization, and that her mission is to destroy it. If the condition of things described in this book—in Sallington and Oxford as in Russia—is the result of a godless world (there is no character with anything approaching religious belief) it provides a lurid object lesson. Indeed, the inevitable nemesis of such a society is the supremacy of physical force of the kind seen by Dione in the vision which ends the book.

If you want something really absurd to make you laugh *1066—And All That* (Methuen, 2s. 6d.), the play at the Strand, based on the book with the same title, will fill the bill. It is very uneven, but has some excellent scenes.

EDITOR.

The Rev. H. F. Frame's *Wonderful, Counsellor* (Hodder, 7s. 6d.), a "study in the life of Jesus," is a fresh and persuasive presentation of the life, teaching, and significance of Jesus. It takes the Gospel stories as they stand without any consideration of critical problems respecting documents, *etc.*, and as far as possible eschews technical language. The book, indeed, seems very largely to have been precipitated in the ordinary course of pulpit teaching. Jesus is represented as beginning with a crystal-clear vision of God, which, first suffering obscuration through the Pharisees and the death of John, is subsequently restored. Most of the miracles are accepted as they stand, though the miraculous draught of fishes and the shekel in the fish's mouth are equally treated as allegory, while the walking on the sea is declared to be fact. It is denied that Jesus ever healed a leper, since leprosy was unknown among the Jews. The disease indicated in the Gospel narratives is something much less serious than leprosy, and we are told that the belief that a malignant disease such as cancer can be cured solely by spiritual means is preposterous and finds no warrant whatever in the sacred writings. The teaching of Jesus is treated on less revolutionary lines than is common to-day. Mr. Frame thinks that

Jesus was not simply a pacifist, and that if he were preaching to-day he would have nothing to say about slums, unemployment, and politics. The writer expounds a "subjective" or "ethical" view of the Atonement and declares that the substitutionary theory is immoral, unjust, and unscriptural. On the whole we should regard this as a useful book to put into the hands of young inquirers.

In the essays in *Losing Religion to Find It* (Dent, 6s.) we have something like an account of Mrs. Lindsay's pilgrimage from philosophic doubt to the light and the power of the Gospel. Beginning with the problem of freedom in a world of necessity she perceives that there is a certain "spaciousness and play" in the very nature of things, and that therefore freedom is a fundamental character of the real. Reality itself is both law and grace, and therefore demands a religious interpretation. Both Fundamentalism and Science are too one-sided to yield the whole truth. Only the Gospel, in the sense of a new life of creative freedom as a gift of grace, can meet man's need. This new life is sacramental inasmuch as it finds God everywhere, in things commonplace and familiar no less than in things lovely and profound. For the physical world is the spiritual world imperfectly seen. Sacramental acts enable us to hold fast to this truth; nevertheless the Christian Sacraments must always be interpreted in spiritual and personal terms, and must never be allowed to become subordinate to material forms, or to be made into exclusive channels.

This is an all too meagre account of a book that is full of rich suggestiveness. Mrs. Lindsay's thought is sometimes elusive and difficult, but it always repays careful study.

E. J. Price.

Professor Daniel Lamont's *Christ and the World of Thought* (Clark, 9s.) is not the easiest of books to read, but it is alive with religious feeling, and as an effort to bring the thought of to-day and the things which belong to faith to a truer understanding, it is of much more than ordinary interest. The first part, under the title "The Frontier of Thought," takes the line that as the world is multi-dimensional, so too is our relation to the total universe of being; God is the ultimate dimension, and our relation to this divine dimension can never be anything else but one of faith. Here one is inclined to go warily, and to ask whether the idea of dimensions can be carried over so exactly into the world of spirit. On the author's showing it would seem as though, apart from revelation we must be content to be a kind of philosophical sceptics. Possibly this is so, and yet to set so sharp and final a frontier between religion and science is surely going too far.

The second part of the book, "The Heritage of Faith," is a defence in some detail of the Christian position, and in the main of the traditional position. In the upshot Dr. Lamont's view seems to be very like a Barthian theology, based on and maintained by this dimensional principle—God is the dimension beyond the frontier of thought, and faith accepts, and must accept, the Word of God. This is to take religion and science into entirely different ranges of the universe. But if so, the question arises how far this does really remove the intellectual difficulties: an occasional lapse in one or two places into something very like special pleading suggests that the argument is not quite satisfactory. And another question is whether Dr. Lamont's position will not in the long run throw the Church back on some old forms of ecclesiastical authority. But leaving all this aside, there is something profoundly moving in much that Dr. Lamont says; especially in the final chapter on "Personal Decision," and when he speaks of the present "eclipse of the soul."

Dr. E. E. Thomas's *A Prelude to Religion* (Unicorn Press, 12s. 6d.) is a somewhat ambitious book, and in the upshot it is a little disappointing. It no doubt suffers a good deal for lack of compression. The author takes a general survey, or bird's-eye view, of most things; including the course of revelation, of philosophy and general science (both old and new), and our modern social structures with the new morality they are creating. The conclusion of all this seems to be that religion must come to terms with the new morality or else go under. The book has interesting points; but it would be improved if Dr. Thomas would give his authorities for many of his statements. Readers of *The Congregational Quarterly,* for instance, will find a quite astonishing account of themselves in this book:

> There arose Brownites, Irvinites (*sic*), Anabaptists, Independents . . . . . These sects never exercised any real influence upon faith and morals; and apart from the Independents, who brought about the fall of the Stuart tyranny and thereby made it possible for the forces of freedom to gather headway, they stood out of all relationship to the constructive political and commercial movements of the times. When a measure of sanity came to them they developed into what are the present dissenting bodies, and the most they ask is to be left alone to worship and to believe in just their own way.

I wonder where Dr. Thomas found out all that: or if we are to take it only in a "Pickwickian sense".

The Rev. R. H. Moberly's *The Great Friendship* (Hamilton, 4s. 6d.), is based on a series of lectures to candidates for the ministry, and on Mr. Moberly's "White Lectures," delivered at St. Paul's in 1930. The main part of the book centres on an exposition of the Lord's Supper as a superlative illustration of God's friendship. The book is written from an Anglican standpoint, but there is much in it that will be helpful and interesting to a general reader with some acquaintance with theology.

Notes on Sins and their Remedies, by A Group of Priests (Faith Press, 2s. 6d.) is distinctly a study in moral theology, intended primarily for those who have to hear confessions; and also as a preparation for Holy Communion. The latter half of the book rests almost entirely on *The Imitation.* There is undoubtedly good work in the book; but occasionally in its treatment of sins it tends to the manufacture of unreal sins, and has, perhaps unavoidably, somewhat of the atmosphere of casuistry.

The Rev. Geoffrey Allen's *Christ the Victorious* (Maclehose, 5s.) is a study of personal religion, and at the same time it covers a wider field of social responsibilities. Mr. Allen has much to say that is good about "Liberty" and "Responsibility"; but the best chapters are those on "Prayer" and "Forgiveness", with their insistence that the individual element in religion, though it has its dangers, is the most fruitful thing in changing the life of the world. The book strikes the note of a sound Christian commonsense.

Professor J. S. Haldane's *The Philosophy of a Biologist* (Oxford Press, 6s.) is interesting as the work of a distinguished biologist, a scientist who is also a philosopher; and for the distinctly personal thread running through it. Prof. Haldane describes his own position as a "spiritual realism." There are chapters in succession on Philosophy and Physical Science, on Biology, Psychology, and finally on Religion. The argument is that each of these subjects covers a more essential field in the interpretation of the universe, physical science being the least. There is thus a progressive, but interdependent movement; a gathering light which

culminates in the realm of religion. The stages are not without some kind of link, but the separation between them is so great, or it seems so great, that something new must be assumed to come in, or be given, at each break: in biology, life as co-ordination; in psychology, the fact of personality; and in religion, the all-encircling personality of God. The argument has at least the merit of being devastating to every sort of materialism, and it certainly puts the new physics in its place. In the chapter on Biology there is a very interesting discussion of colour contrasts. In the chapter on Religion Prof. Haldane says:

> There is no inherent reason for conflict between science, philosophy, and religion; but conflict inevitably arises when either religion or science assumes an artificial and inadequate form.

This is a book many ministers will wish to read; but 6s. for 155 pages is a rather stiff price.

A. T. S. James.

Canon Lindsay Dewar calls *Man and God* (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.) "An Essay in the Psychology and Philosophy of Religious Experience." It is based on some courses of lectures given in America and illustrates the author's belief that the supreme religious problem of the present time is the problem of religious experience. His main argument is to the effect that religious experience is primarily intuitive. It has three main supports—the empirical, the ontological, and the axiological, but the greatest of these is the empirical. After thus defining his subject Canon Dewar goes on to deal first with the psychological attack on religious experience at the hands of Freud and Jung. Here he covers a good deal of familiar ground, but his criticism of the new psychology is convincing enough. He then passes to the attack on religious experience from the philosophical side and deals with St. Thomas Aquinas and modern writers like Rashdall and Tennant. Then he passes to the discussion of various forms of religious experience, mainly those of a mystical character, and distinguishes between the value of corporate and individual experience. In discussing religious experience as the fundamental ground of belief he has a good deal to say in criticism of Schleiermacher and of the older forms of the ontological argument. His book ends rather abruptly with a slight and not altogether relevant sketch of religious experience in the Old and New Testaments respectively.

Canon Dewar thus gives a very useful summary of the modern position so far as the grounds of religious belief are concerned, but he does not escape the criticism which he directs against others who have sought to ground religion in experience alone. He is himself prone to the same kind of subjectivism that he discerns and deplores in other writers. He has very little to say about revelation, and is so much taken up with the value of mysticism as sometimes to lose sight of the supreme object of the religious consciousness.

The Roots of Religion (S.C.M., 2s. 6d.), by the Rev. C. H. S. Matthews, Chaplain of Marlborough, consists of a series of addresses given to Marlborough School boys on the beginnings of religion. Their aim is to put the Bible into its proper setting and to give some idea of the rise and development of religious ideas. Mr. Matthews deals with the subject in a simple and straightforward fashion and the book should be very useful to teachers generally.

Dr. A. E. Garvie has already written a good deal on the subject of revelation, and in *Revelation through History and Experience* (Nicholson & Watson, 5s.), which is based on some lectures given in London, he takes the opportunity of summing up his ideas on the subject. The book is

really a compendium of theology, dealing as it does with God the Father, with Jesus as Christ and Lord, and with the Holy Spirit as the Life-giver. Dr. Garvie writes with all the weight and clarity which we have learned to expect from him, and his general outlook and conclusions are wise and sound. There is a good deal of criticism in the book: Barthianism, *Formgeschichte,* and certain forms of Modernism come in for some severe handling. But, again, it is all very sensible, and most readers will find that Dr. Garvie carries them along with him. Though small in compass, the book is a real contribution to a very vital subject.

Dr. E. T. Bell is a Professor of Mathematics in the California Institute of Technology, and *The Search for Truth* (Allen & Unwin, 7s. 6d.) purports to be "a history of scientific thought from the earliest times until now." It is difficult, however, to take it seriously. Prof. Bell seems to write always with his tongue in his cheek and in a style that is altogether his own. He is a great hand at smashing idols, and with a good deal of his iconoclasm one cannot but sympathize. His flippancy will amuse some readers and disgust others. The following quotation is a fair example both of his style and of his method. Speaking of the thinkers of the Middle Ages, he says:

> They backed the wrong horse. They made in fact the worst bet our race has ever placed; they backed Aristotle to carry their colours over the line. Their mistake was a very human one, if we remember the kind of intellectual slum in which they lived, and one deserving of our sympathy rather than of our contempt for them as a lot of suckers who had never seen a real horse, but who would bet on whatever nag the bookmakers had to sell. According to the bookies Aristotle was their best bet. All the wise guys of the past seven or eight centuries had put their money on Aristotle, and where were they now? Why, just look at them! Holding down fat jobs, gassing to the cream of intellectual society. Soft? and How! Bet on Aristotle and you will move into the upper five hundred over night. Your best intellects of the age will be with you and you will be putting your feet right under the same mahogany with them at the next New Thought Club banquet.

For those who like this sort of thing, this is just the sort of thing they like, and really there seems little more to be said about this book.

Mr. W. Romaine Paterson's *Problems of Destiny* (Watts, 5s. 0d.) is the latest volume in the Library of Science and Culture, whose object is to

> present to the general reader a picture of the world both of action and of thought as science is shaping it.

This is an excellent programme, but everything will depend on the way in which it is carried out. Mr. Paterson's contribution to it is not very helpful because it is almost entirely negative. His book amounts to little more than a defence of heredity as leading up to determinism and fatalism. In the course of his argument Mr. Paterson discusses questions like Education, Morality, Hedonism, and Pessimism, and on all of them he has something interesting to say. He commits himself to a good many offhand judgments, and it is difficult to acquit him of the vice of quick thinking. As, for example,

> education is the attempt of the older generation to force its knowledge, and especially its moral notions and its religious beliefs, on the younger.
>
> In what are called the ages of faith but which were really the ages of intolerance, it was only religious education which was compulsory just as in the case of savage tribes.
>
> Religion was called in as a sort of supernatural police in order to strengthen the approbation or disapprobation of the community.
>
> Pessimism apparently means that if you ask for a bath bun you are certain to receive a bath brick.

All the same, there is a great deal in this book that is worth reading, especially if the reader will remember that it represents only one aspect of a big subject and that its judgments need to be taken with a grain of salt.

W. B. SELBIE.

The first half of Prof. William Creighton Graham's *The Prophets and Israel's Culture* (Chicago and Cambridge University Presses, 7s.) describes the growth of that cultural environment of the Nearer East into which the Hebrew prophets were born; against this background their distinctive ideas are characterized, these being a universal outlook on the world, higher motives, and a new regard for human personality. The book is brightly written and may help to interpret the modern significance of the prophets, in which the author's interest chiefly lies, but it makes no contribution to *O.T.* scholarship. It is one of a series of "Handbooks of Ethics and Religion."

The Rev. Valentin-M. Breton's *The Blessed Trinity* (Sands, 3s. 6d.), in the series "The Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge," is a translation from the French. Of its three parts, the first seeks to establish the Catholic doctrine exegetically from the *N.T.*, the second gives a popular exposition of the theological teaching of the Church, and the third urges and illustrates the significance of the doctrine in personal devotion and the rites of the Church. The book is naturally intended for Catholic readers and has the rigidity of all such treatments; but Protestants can gain from it a clear conception of the orthodox doctrine, and of its Augustinian-Thomist exposition, whilst the devotional spirit of the author—a catechist of adults—is everywhere manifest and often suggestive.

H. WHEELER ROBINSON.

NEW EDITIONS, REPRINTS, *ETC.*

The Synoptic Gospels, arranged in parallel columns, by J. M. Thompson (Oxford Press), an invaluable aid first published in 1910, is now brought within the reach of every student by the photographically reproduced impression at 10s. 6d. Dr. Fosdick's *A Pilgrimage to Palestine* is now published at 5s. by the S.C.M., who have also issued Canon F. R. Barry's *A Philosophy from Prison,* and Canon Peter Green's *Betting and Gambling* in the "Religion and Life" Books at 1s. The cheap edition of *Tell John* (Maclehose) by the Revs. Geoffrey Allen and Roy McKay is 3s. 6d. and of Dr. Inge's *Protestantism* (Nelson) 1s. 6d. Dr. Inge's selections from the German Mystics of the Middle Ages, *Light, Life, and Love,* first published in 1904, is now re-issued in different format in a third edition (Methuen, 3s. 6d.), while Mr. William Kingsland's *An Anthology of Mysticism and Mystical Philosophy* (Methuen) is now 5s. Of Roman Catholic books, Fr. C. C. J. Martindale's *Christianity is Christ* (Sheed & Ward, 5s.) prints five books in one volume, Fr. Bede Jarrett's *Vocation to Marriage* (Sheed & Ward, 3s. 6d.) contains eighteen discourses which formed part of *The House of Gold,* published in 1931, and Dom Bede Camm's *Anglican Memories* (Burns, Oates, 2s. 6d.) was published 40 years ago *minus* names. It tells of his Anglo-Catholic days and companions at Keble and Cuddesdon, and will, we imagine, keep anybody who reads it away from Rome! Anything less like the Gospels we cannot imagine. Jacques Maritain's *The Freedom of the Intellect* (Sheed & Ward, 3s. 6d.) is made up of pretended conversations with the sage Theonas, and was first published in 1933 under the title *Theonas.* Longmans have reprinted F. W. H. Myers's *Human Personality and its Survival of Bodily Death* in their "Swan Library" (3s. 6d.). Mr. G. K. Chesterton's *George Bernard Shaw* is now in the

"Week-End Library" (Lane, 3s. 6d.), while Prof. J. M. Creed's *Joseph Armitage Robinson, 1858-1933* (Oxford Press, 1s.) is a British Academy reprint. We are very glad that Edith Gittings Reid's very fine life of Sir William Osler, *The Great Physician,* has now been published in a popular edition (Oxford Press, 7s. 6d.). Another biography which has just been re-issued is Bonamy Dobrée's *William Penn* (Constable, 6s.). Our appeal for a cheaper edition of Lord Davies's *Force* (Constable) is answered by one at 3s. 6d. instead of 21s. *Politicians and the Public Service* (Allen & Unwin, 1s.) is a reprint of articles in the *New English Weekly* on the Douglas-Pennant case. The six new "Everyman" volumes (2s. each) appear in a new dress, plainer but more pleasing than the familiar binding. Messrs. Dent are to be commended on their enterprise in bringing books within the reach of those with little cash to spare, many of whom will rejoice to add to their list Henry James, *The Turn of the Screw* and *The Aspern Papers,* G. K. Chesterton, *Stories, Essays, and Poems,* D. H. Lawrence, *The White Peacock,* H. G. Wells, *The Time Machine* and *The Wheels of Chance,* Meredith, *The Ordeal of Richard Feverel,* and Galsworthy, *The Country House.* Three new volumes in the "Thinker's Library" (Watts, 1s.) are Mr. A. Gowans Whyte's *The Religion of the Open Mind,* Mr. J. M. Robertson's *Letters on Reasoning,* and Mr. A. E. Mander's *Psychology for Everyman (and Woman).*

LECTURES, ADDRESSES, *ETC.*

Mr. W. E. Wilson's *Our Response to God* (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d. & 1s. 6d.) is a Swarthmore Lecture not unworthy to stand in an excellent succession. Dr. Percy Dearmer's Essex Hall Lecture, *Christianity as a New Religion* (Lindsey Press, 1s.)—see under "Worth Noting"—finds Dr. Moffatt's name a great problem. We must protest against the price of Prof. W. E. Clark's Ingersoll Lecture, *Indian Conceptions of Immortality* (Harvard & Oxford Presses)—4s. 6d. for less than 50 pages with the exchange at about par is utterly unreasonable. The Rev. E. A. Payne's *Anti-God Propaganda* (Baptist World Alliance, 6d.) is an address to the Baptist World Congress at Berlin which should be widely noted. Dr. G. P. Gooch's *Dictatorship in Theory and Practice* (Watts, 1s.) is the Conway Memorial Lecture, 1935, and Dr. Rendel Harris's *The Tiber and the Rhine* (University of London Press, 1s. 6d.) is No. 9 of "The After-glow Essays." Lord David Cecil's *Jane Austen* (Cambridge Press, 1s. 6d.) is a sympathetic study. The Archbishop of York's *Christ and the Way to Peace* is issued by the S.C.M. at 6d. Three new "Day to Day Pamphlets" (Hogarth Press, 1s. 6d.) are Prof. Harold J. Laski's *Law and Justice in Soviet Russia,* Mr. S. H. Bailey's *Mr. Roosevelt's Experiments,* and Mr. Thomas Sharp's *A Derelict Area.* Next come volumes of broadcast addresses. *The Way to God* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d.) consists of the first series of the talks under this title given by the Revs. F. A. Iremonger, J. S. Whale, and the Dean of St. Paul's. Nos. 1-3 of "Heroes of the Free Churches" (Epworth Press, 6d.) each contain three broadcast addresses (Dr. Gregory on three Methodists, John Wesley, Francis Asbury, Thomas Coke; the Rev. E. Shillito on three Congregationalists, John Robinson, R. W. Dale, and David Livingstone; and the Rev. M. E. Aubrey on three Baptists, John Bunyan, William Carey, and Adoniram Judson). Mr. A. L. Rowse and Dr. G. B. Harrison publish broadcast talks in *Queen Elizabeth and Her Subjects* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.), Mr. Rowse adding a final chapter, "The Elizabethan Age." *The Causes of War* (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.) contains addresses broadcast by Dr. Inge, Lord Beaverbrook, Prof. G. D. H. Cole, Sir Josiah Stamp, Sir Norman Angell, Mr. Aldous Huxley, Major C. H. Douglas, and Sir

Austen Chamberlain, while *The Treaty of Versailles and After* (Allen & Unwin, 5s.) consists of addresses by Lord Riddell, Prof. C. K. Webster, Prof. Arnold J. Toynbee, Prof. Denis Saurat, Baron Werner von Rheinbaben, Senatore Forges Davanzati, Mrs. M. Tappan Hollond, Lord Reading, and Sir Norman Angell. The Rev. Lionel B. Fletcher's *Skipper My Chum* (Lutterworth Press, 6s.), dog stories broadcast in New Zealand, will appeal to dog lovers.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (April). An excellent number. Dr. Vincent Taylor's "From Tradition to Gospel," Dr. H. G. Meecham's "The Pragmatic Note in the Gospels" and the Rev. J. A. Findlay's "The Self-Consciousness of Jesus" are interesting *N.T.* studies. Mr. E. E. Kellett's "A Great Illusion" demolishes the charge of joylessness in the Puritans. The Rev. D. Howard Smith writes on "Moh Toi, A Chinese Prophet." The notes and discussions, too, are very good, but how Dr. Peake must turn in his grave to see the two-page review of Mr. St. John Ervine's *God's Soldier* with the author's name spelt wrongly throughout.

The Hibbert Journal (April). A varied number, in which we found Prof. T. C. Hall's "Continental Protestantism and English Dissent" extremely pertinent. Prof. R. B. Mowat writes on "The Treachery of the Intellectuals," Mr. J. A. Hobson on "Force Necessary to Government," and Prof. H. L. Stewart on "Can Parliamentary Government Endure?" The Rev. L. J. Collins defends Loisy, and Dr. F. A. M. Spencer puts the case for the reality of Demonic Powers. Sir Richard W. Livingstone writes on "Christianity and Hellenism," Dr. Foakes Jackson on "Anna Comnena," and Mr. A. L. Maycock on "Bede and Alcuin." Prof. Dawes Hicks surveys recent philosophical literature.

The Baptist Quarterly (April). Dr. Whitley's article on Thomas Helwys has since been reprinted. The Rev. H. C. Rowse writes on "The Barthian Challenge to Christian Thought", the Rev. H. J. Flowers on "The Epistle to the Thessalonians," the Rev. E. A. Payne on "Some Sidelights on Pearce and His Friends," and Mr. W. W. Lawson on "Robert and James Haldane."

The Baptist Layman (April). Dr. H. R. Williamson discusses "The B.M.S. Outlook in China for 1935," the Rev. James Mursell writes "Something about Australian Baptists," and Principal Whale's address on "The Preacher's Authority" is printed. Mr. O. H. B. Starte's "Indian Criminal Tribes and Their Uplift" is an important contribution.

The Modern Churchman (March-May). Three live numbers of this magazine, discussing mainly the life of the Church of England, but with its eye on the work of all the churches. The Rev. G. F. Elvey's "The Church of Scotland and some comparisons with the Church of England" and Mr. J. A. Bramley's "A Parson in Revolt" specially deserve attention.

The Church Quarterly Review (April). Dr. W. H. Rigg writes on "The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel," Mr. Ponsonby Sullivan discusses recent books on "Church and Religion in England 1660-1800," and Canon S. Addleshaw writes on Charlotte M. Yonge and the High Church movement. The Rev. F. L. Cross surveys "Some Recent Work in English Philosophy," and there are some valuable notes on the Church in Finland.

The Expository Times (April-June). In the series "Things most certainly Believed" there are articles by Dr. James Reid, Dr. D. S. Cairns, and Mr. H. G. Wood. "Some Outstanding New Testament Problems" are dealt with by Dr. G. S. Duncan, Dr. G. H. C. Macgregor, and Dr. C. J. Cadoux. There are the usual features in a magazine which maintains its usefulness.

The Christian Quarterly (April). Especially useful is the section "Practical Church Problems," which includes an American case study of a man of thirty and an outline order of service for the election of Presbyters and Deacons.

Social Service Review (March-May). The most valuable articles in these numbers of this informing little magazine (published by the National Council of Social Service) are "Unemployment"—by an unemployed miner's wife, and Mr. John Miller's "Local Education Authorities and Voluntary Occupational Centres."

The Common Room (March). The articles by A. Barratt Brown on "Democratic Leadership," A. and S. E. Raistrick on "Preparing the Foundations," and Captain D. Euan Wallace on "Reports of Investigations into the Industrial Conditions in Certain Depressed Areas" ought to be read.

Religion in Education (April). The Editor is making use of scholars most effectively. Dr. Wheeler Robinson explains "The Place of the *O.T.* in Christian Education," Dr. W. F. Lofthouse writes on "What Shall We Teach About Jesus ?" and Mr. H. G. Wood on "The Value of Form Criticism for the Teaching of the Gospels." Other articles deal with such practical problems as "Making and Producing Bible Plays" (Mona Swann), and "Individual Methods in Religious Teaching" (Florence Taylor).

The International Review of Missions (April). Dr. J. T. Addison tells of "Group Conversion in Medieval Europe" and Mr. P. O. Philip of "The Harijan Movement in India." Dr. Garvie examines the sharing suggested in *Re-thinking Missions*, Pasteur H. P. Junod has a long article on "Anthropology and Missionary Education," and there is a description by Dr. C. A. Clark of the Nevius methods.

World Dominion (April). The Rev. T. Stanley Soltau's "Christian Progress in Korea" should be read after the article in the I.R.M. just mentioned. Other articles deal with the work of non-professional missionaries, and the survey, as usual, is as wide as the world.

The Evangelical Quarterly (April). There is an outstanding contribution by the Rev. C. K. Hammond on "God's Sovereignty and Man's Freedom." Dr. W. Harvey-Jellie's "Back to the Reformed Theology" and the Rev. W. H. Guiton's "Can We be Modern without being Modernists ?" have their message.

Religion in Life (Spring). The contributors include Dr. G. W. Richards ("Karl Marx and Friedrich Nietzsche"), Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin ("Can Liberalism Survive ?"), the Rev. E. F. Scott ("Religion and Freedom"), the Rev. E. Shillito ("Immortality and Liberty"), Dr. J. G. Gilkey ("Helping Discouraged People"), the Rev. H. H. Farmer ("The Christian and War"), Dr. George A. Barton ("Archæology and the Bible"), the Rev. R. Birch Hoyle ("Karl Barth's Fight for Soul-Liberty"), and Dr. E. G. Homrighausen ("The Mediator").

The Yale Review (Spring). The bias this quarter is decidedly political, with Mr. Alvin Johnson's "Homesteads and Subsistence Homesteads," Prof. John Dickinson's "The Perennial Cry of Bureaucracy," Mr. Charles Warren's "Prepare for Neutrality," and Mr. Carleton Beals's "A Self-Sufficient Latin America." Sigrid Undset writes on "Dreams," and there is a good story, "Hawk," by Mr. John Cowles.

The Colgate-Rochester Divinity School Bulletin (Spring). Mr. C. H. Moehlman writes on "The Torrey Gospels," Mr. C. H. Sears on "Variant Church Groups," and Mr. G. R. Berry on "The Changing East," in which he studies Christian customs in Palestine and Transjordania. An important historical study is Mr. E. C. Starr's "The Story of Ordination Among the Baptists."

The Review and Expositor (April). The main articles this quarter are Mr. Lester Redding's "The Thought Side of Christian Religion" and Prof. G. S. Dobbins's "Theological Education in a Changing Social Order." Mr. I. G. Murray's "The Pastor Getting Started and Getting On" ought to be reprinted and circulated to all young ministers.

The Harvard Theological Review (Jan.). The chief article is Mr. M. P. Charlesworth's "Some Observations on Ruler-Cult, especially in Rome." Dr. Souter writes on "Greek and Hebrew Words in Jerome's Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel."

Anglican Theological Review (April). The Editors have solved the question presented by the spate of books by devoting three-quarters of the present issue to reviews. These are preceded by an helpful article by Dean Grant on "Worship and Experience."